Calendar No. 168

101st Congress
1st Session

SENATE

Report
101-83

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1990

July 25 (legislative day January 3), 1989.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Johnston, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2696]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2696) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1990

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$18,543,010,000
Budget estimates considered by House	18,378,373,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	18,378,373,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	18,432,972,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the budget estimate, 1990	+54,599,000
Under the House-passed bill	−110,038,000

19-737

S183-2

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:

- Corps of Engineers—Civil: Page
  - Construction, general 22
  - Flood control and coastal emergencies 33
  - Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 33
  - General expenses 55
  - General investigations 6
  - General regulatory functions 54
  - Operation and maintenance, general 38

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:

- Bureau of Reclamation:
  - Construction Program 60
  - Emergency fund 68
  - General administrative expenses 68
  - General investigations 57
  - Loan Program 67
  - Operation and maintenance 66
  - Working Capital Fund 68

TITLE III

Department of Energy:

- Atomic energy defense activities 134
- Departmental administration 173
- Energy supply, research and development activities 70
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 185
- General science and research activities 122
- Geothermal Resources Development Fund 186
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund 131
- Office of Inspector General 176
- Power marketing administrations:
  - Alaska Power Administration 180
  - Bonneville Power Administration 180
  - Southeastern Power Administration 184
  - Southwestern Power Administration 184
  - Western Area Power Administration 184
- Uranium supply and enrichment activities 117

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:

- Appalachian Regional Commission 187
- Defense Nuclear Safety Board 187
- Delaware River Basin Commission 188
- Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 188
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission 189
- Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board 192
- Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator 192
- Susquehanna River Basin Commission 190
- Tennessee Valley Authority 191

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1990 beginning October 1, 1989, and ending September 30, 1990, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1990 budget estimates for the bill total $18,378,373,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $18,432,972,000. This is $54,599,000 over the budget estimates and $110,038,000 under the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $9,554,098,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$568,980,000
Research and development	1,364,015,000
Production and surveillance	2,547,374,000
Nuclear materials production	2,173,574,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	1,556,731,000
Nuclear directed energy weapons SDI	110,000,000
New production reactor	303,500,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,215,466,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$94,606,000
Environment, safety and health	321,465,000
Nuclear fission R&D	579,875,000
Magnetic fusion	330,450,000
Basic energy sciences	594,000,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $1,098,431,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$596,230,000
Nuclear physics	300,300,000
Superconducting super collider	225,000,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $829,885,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$150,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	116,550,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	442,100,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	113,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,174,915,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal Water Resource Development Program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affect and benefit all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide hydroelectric power production and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for thousands of urban residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

1990 NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS

The Committee recommendation includes funding for 24 new construction starts of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. This compares to 11 projects proposed in the budget and 44 projects funded by the House.

The Committee was faced with tough choices in arriving at its recommendation. Requests were received from many Members of the House and Senate to initiate numerous meritorious projects. But the large pool, 50 plus projects, and the extremely limited budgetary resources have dictated that the numbers be scaled back from that provided in the House bill.

The Committee feels strongly that we must not continue the past bankrupt policy which ignores the infrastructure needs of the country. Yet in order to address the flood control, navigation, municipal and industrial water supply, and other basic needs of the country, additional budgetary priority will have to be given to water resources development. Otherwise, the Committee will be forced to limit the level of new investment in the future.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held nine sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1990 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies, numerous Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 1990, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on July 20, 1989, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on July 25, 1989, recommended that the bill, as amended be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Corps of Engineers—Civil

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1989	$142,405,000
Budget estimate, 1990	126,108,000
House allowance	123,312,000
Committee recommendation	131,086,000

An appropriation of $131,086,000 is recommended by the Committee.

The recommended amounts provided under this account for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	ALABAMA								
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL....................................	3,811,000	191,000	---	134,000	---	134,000	---	134,000
	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL....................................	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL.......	729,000	629,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	ALASKA								
(SP)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION..........................	11,100,000	563,000	---	---	---	---	---	270,000
(FC)	HOMER SPIT FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION, AK................	2,600,000	124,000	---	102,000	---	102,000	---	102,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK......................................	14,670,000	529,000	---	419,000	---	419,000	---	419,000
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS, AK................................	9,749,000	8,803,000	620,000	---	620,000	---	620,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION, AK....................	337,000	---	137,000	---	68,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	UNALASKA FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION, AK..................	500,000	187,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ...	875,000	450,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ..	8,500,000	950,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBS, SALT-GILA, AZ...................	1,250,000	500,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY, AZ.......................	500,000	---	200,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ............................	1,254,000	654,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ.......................................	5,250,000	300,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
	RILLITO RIVER, AZ......................................	---	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ..............................	1,250,000	---	500,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & OK.........................	2,110,000	1,915,000	195,000	---	195,000	---	195,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL ARKANSAS STUDY, AR............................	1,500,000	600,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	HOT SPRINGS, GARLAND COUNTY, AR.......................	1,050,000	200,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	RED RIVER WATERWAY, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX......	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
	AMERICAN SAMOA								
(COM)	TERRITORIES DEVELOPMENT STUDY, AS.....................	1,050,000	382,000	218,000	---	218,000	---	218,000	---
	CALIFORNIA								
(FC)	CACHE CREEK BASIN (OUTLET CHANNEL), CA................	12,400,000	1,950,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	CALIENTE CREEK, CA.....................................	40,700,000	1,100,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(SPE)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES, CA........	7,870,000	7,297,000	573,000	---	573,000	---	573,000	---
(FC)	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA.........................	31,200,000	900,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK, ROSEVILLE, CA..............................	3,440,000	400,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA....................................	21,800,000	2,000,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA...............	875,000	350,000	315,000	---	315,000	---	315,000	---
(FDP)	IMPERIAL AND SAN DIEGO COUNTY STREAMS - SALTON SEA, CA	1,261,000	511,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW, CA...........	187,500,000	---	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---
	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA..................	---	---	---	---	---	750,000	---	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA................................	6,140,000	---	---	550,000	---	275,000	---	550,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN RAFAEL, CA................	600,000	550,000	50,000	---	112,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	MONTEREY HARBOR, CA..................................	775,000	---	310,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.................................	3,000,000	---	---	200,000	---	100,000	---	200,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA.......................................	63,860,000	3,190,000	---	1,178,000	---	1,178,000	---	858,000
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED,	2,025,000	1,760,000	265,000	---	390,000	---	265,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO METRO AREA, CA	1,125,000	750,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	1,250,000	500,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA................	6,800,000	1,423,000	---	137,000	---	137,000	---	137,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA.................................	2,400,000	200,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(FDP)	PINE FLAT DAM, KINGS RIVER, CA.......................	1,375,000	550,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA..............................	---	---	---	---	45,000	---	90,000	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR), CA......................	3,200,000	600,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL (GCID), CA............	---	---	---	---	---	180,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA.....................	3,665,000	2,857,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE, CA......................	920,000	855,000	65,000	---	65,000	---	65,000	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA................	875,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALAVERAS RIVER, CA.........	1,125,000	450,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA............	1,125,000	935,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, MOKELUMNE RIVER & TRIBS, CA..	1,225,000	---	490,000	---	245,000	---	490,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R SEDIMENTATION I	1,250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA..............	690,000	600,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	SAN LORENZO, CA......................................	1,232,000	857,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE CO, CA......................	9,550,000	9,295,000	255,000	---	255,000	---	255,000	---
(SP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, CA.............................	940,000	530,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(RDP)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.............................	420,000	357,000	63,000	---	63,000	---	63,000	---
(SP)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA..........................	400,000	260,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA............................	1,200,000	480,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA...................................	5,000,000	100,000	---	440,000	---	440,000	---	440,000
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA...............................	1,436,000	1,286,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	COLORADO								
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO..	4,380,000	---	---	240,000	---	120,000	---	120,000
(FDP)	BOX ELDER CREEK BASIN, CO............................	350,000	100,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	BOXELDER, SPRING & DRY CREEKS, FT COLLINS, CO.........	442,000	---	168,000	---	84,000	---	168,000	---
(FC)	COLORADO SPRINGS, FOUNTAIN CREEK, CO.................	7,000,000	---	---	220,000	---	110,000	---	110,000
(FDP)	GOOSE CREEK, BOULDER, CO.............................	310,000	---	120,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO........................	295,000	130,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(COM)	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.........	500,000	350,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
	DELAWARE								
(N)	CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL (DEEPENING), DE & MD......	2,615,000	400,000	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ......................	755,000	---	---	---	225,000	---	---	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND...	2,250,000	---	750,000	---	375,000	---	750,000	---
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY............................	12,100,000	2,027,000	---	273,000	---	273,000	---	273,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	FLORIDA								
	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	BROWARD COUNTY, FL	475,000	195,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,600,000	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---	300,000
	CANAVERAL HARBOR (SAND BYPASS), FL	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL	8,230,000	1,240,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
	FT DESOTO PARK, FL	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	FROG POND, FL	---	---	---	---	77,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL	605,000	250,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	HILLSBORO INLET (BROWARD COUNTY), FL	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
(FDP)	LOWER HILLSBORO RIVER & CURIOSITY CREEK, FL	640,000	---	175,000	---	87,000	---	175,000	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	20,200,000	700,000	---	605,000	---	605,000	---	605,000
	MIAMI WATERFRONT PARKS, FL	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	MONROE COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	---	---	96,000	---	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	30,628,000	839,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	---	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	100,000
	ST JOHNS RIVER, FL	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST PETERSBURG AND VICINITY, FL	625,000	345,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	SOUTH CENTRAL FLORIDA SIMULATION MODEL, FL	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	TAMPA BAY (PORT SUTTON), FL	---	---	---	---	---	62,000	---	125,000
	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	100,000
	GEORGIA								
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	7,080,000	---	---	600,000	---	300,000	---	600,000
	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA	---	---	---	---	600,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN MACON AREA, GA	765,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE, GA	8,940,000	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA	700,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	660,000	505,000	155,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
	HAWAII								
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HI	5,030,000	491,000	---	259,000	---	259,000	---	259,000
(N)	HILO HARBOR, HI	2,760,000	---	---	150,000	---	75,000	---	150,000
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	3,193,000	233,000	---	95,000	---	95,000	---	95,000
(FDP)	URBAN FLOOD CONTROL - HONOLULU, HI	750,000	---	300,000	---	150,000	---	300,000	---
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER & TRIBS, ID, MT, OR, & WA	21,423,000	20,996,000	427,000	---	427,000	---	427,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, VICINITY OF GOODING AND SHOSHONE, I	3,900,000	---	---	200,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(RDP)	MUD LAKE, ID	482,000	299,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	PALOUSE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WA	522,000	362,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY	8,231,000	7,652,000	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	1,105,000	730,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(RCP)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY, IL	1,900,000	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS (CUP), IL	321,000,000	---	---	---	---	750,000	---	---
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY	801,000,000	9,105,000	---	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---	3,800,000
(FDP)	SOUTH FORK SANGAMON RIVER, IL	425,000	170,000	155,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO, WI.	2,550,000	---	600,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WEST FRANKFORT AND VICINITY, IL	600,000	250,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	INDIANA								
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	10,225,000	550,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	20,600,000	215,000	---	195,000	---	95,000	---	195,000
	JEFFERSONVILLE, IN	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH RIVER BASIN, IN & MI	1,010,000	448,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WABASH RIV BASIN COMP STUDY, IN & IL (MID WABASH INTER	750,000	250,000	200,000	---	325,000	---	200,000	---
	IOWA								
	BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IA	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
	MISSOURI R FISH & WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, KS, MO.	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	300,000
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM RE-EVALUATION, IA, NE, MO.	675,000	250,000	93,000	---	93,000	---	93,000	---
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	22,600,000	1,103,000	---	187,000	---	187,000	---	187,000
(FDP)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, IA	260,000	104,000	10,000	---	10,000	---	10,000	---
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES-DES MOINES, IA	11,900,000	575,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000
	KANSAS								
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	11,600,000	191,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000
(FDP)	ARK RIVER AND TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA, OK	4,840,000	4,051,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	CANEY RIVER, KS & OK	856,000	509,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(RCP)	SOLDIER CREEK DIVERSION UNIT (MOD), TOPEKA, KS	355,000	155,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	679,000	460,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FC)	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED, KS	9,800,000	441,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	600,000	---	---	200,000	---	100,000	---	200,000
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN &.	12,565,000	7,515,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	---	---	---	---	110,000	---	---	---
(N)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,800,000	600,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	HAZARD, KY	6,100,000	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (JACKSON INTERIM), KY.	1,020,000	---	---	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, KY	2,000,000	200,000	600,000	---	750,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, IN AND KY	189,700,000	---	---	350,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FDP)	METRO LOUISVILLE, KY	1,500,000	600,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	NEWPORT, KY	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	18,040,000	15,080,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY	---	---	---	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
	SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	200,000
(N)	UNIONTOWN LOCKS AND DAM, KY, IL & IN	3,500,000	---	800,000	---	400,000	---	800,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	LOUISIANA								
(FC)	ALOHA RIGOLETTE, LA.	1,000,000	239,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LA.	2,301,000	2,037,030	189,000	---	189,000	---	189,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA.	292,000	186,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA.	18,000,000	---	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	400,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION.	3,986,000	3,776,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, COMPREHENSIVE COASTAL WETLANDS	1,339,000	400,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA.	644,000	508,000	67,000	---	67,000	---	67,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LAND LOSS & MARSH CREATION, LA	1,678,000	1,206,000	157,000	---	157,000	---	157,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, MISSISSIPPI RIVER DELTA, LA.	1,485,000	539,000	305,000	---	305,000	---	305,000	---
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, GIWW TO THE GULF, LA.	920,000	---	230,000	---	115,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION AND CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECH	5,287,000	3,711,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(COM)	RED RIVER BASIN, AR & LA, COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.	2,780,000	450,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT, LA TO INDEX, AR.	---	---	---	---	---	55,000	---	55,000
(FC)	TANGIPAHOA, TCHEFUNCTE, & TICKFAW RIVERS, LA.	---	---	---	524,000	---	262,000	---	524,000
(FC)	UPPER BAYOU TECHE, LA.	---	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER & BAYOU TIGRE, LA.	732,000	265,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	WEST BANK OF THE MISS R IN THE VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS	1,848,000	1,702,000	146,000	---	146,000	---	146,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MAINE								
(FDP)	ANDROSCOGGIN RIVER, ME & NH............................	760,000	341,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	KENNEBEC RIVER, ME......................................	885,000	389,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	PENOBSCOT RIVER, ME.....................................	885,000	350,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SACO RIVER, ME & NH.....................................	760,000	250,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.................	960,000	---	260,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY (SHORELINE EROSION), MD & VA............	1,985,000	1,723,000	262,000	---	262,000	---	262,000	---
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA & DC...	1,500,000	1,325,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD & WV...........	400,000	---	150,000	---	75,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV....................	1,550,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA..	16,830,000	---	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	400,000
(SP)	COASTAL BREACH AT NAUSET BEACH, CHATHAM, MA............	760,000	320,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CONNECTICUT RIVER, MA....................................	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(CON)	CONN RVR BSN, WESTFIELD RIVER FLOOD CONTROL............	1,317,000	1,017,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SAUGUS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MA..........................	45,630,000	---	---	1,000,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	SPICKET RIVER, MA & NH..................................	625,000	250,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MICHIGAN								
(FC)	ECORSE CREEK, MI...	4,250,000	---	---	125,000	---	62,000	---	62,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS & HBR FINAL RPT, MI, M	5,800,000	---	---	100,000	---	50,000	---	100,000
	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI................................	---	---	---	---	---	70,000	---	---
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI..	58,950,000	642,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, DEEP DRAFT, MI.........................	398,000	---	136,000	---	68,000	---	136,000	---
	ST LAWRENCE SEAWAY & GREAT LAKES, MI, MN, WI, NY......	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SOUTHERN WAYNE COUNTY, MI................................	475,000	130,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN..	885,000	200,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI........................	7,050,000	596,000	---	154,000	---	154,000	---	154,000
(FC)	HOUSTON, MN..	5,510,000	757,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000
(FDP)	RAINY RIVER BASIN, MN....................................	1,010,000	500,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	RED LAKE AND CLEARWATER RIVERS, MN.......................	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	ST. PAUL, MN...	6,800,000	750,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(RDP)	WAHPETON, ND - BRECKENRIDGE, MN..........................	255,000	100,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	CANEY CREEK, JACKSON, MS.................................	410,000	---	160,000	---	80,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS............................	850,000	350,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	LOWER PEARL RIVER BASIN, FLOW DISTRIBUTION, MS & LA...	640,000	391,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREAS, MS.......................	436,000	353,000	83,000	---	83,000	---	83,000	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS....................................	37,006,000	1,625,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000
(FDP)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL...............	3,561,000	3,438,000	123,000	---	123,000	---	123,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	MISSOURI								
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	472,000	345,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO	13,900,000	1,785,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000
(FC)	COLDWATER CREEK, MO	15,200,000	---	---	600,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	CUIVRE RIVER AREA, MO	805,000	400,000	45,000	---	45,000	---	45,000	---
(FDP)	DARDENNE CREEK, MO	871,000	---	259,000	---	129,000	---	259,000	---
(RDP)	DRY FORK AND EAST FORK LAKES, FISHING RIVER, MO	510,000	---	205,000	---	102,000	---	205,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND RIVER BASIN, MO	785,000	320,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	MALINE CREEK, MO	39,800,000	2,199,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
	PLATTIN CREEK, MO	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO	12,650,000	382,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH AND VICINITY, MO	833,000	245,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
	STE. GENEVIEVE, MO	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	350,000	150,000	10,000	---	100,000	---	10,000	---
	ELM CREEK, NE	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	296,000	220,000	62,000	---	62,000	---	62,000	---
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LOWER TRUCKEE RECONNAISSANCE STUDY	100,000	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS -DUCK CREEK/BLUE DIAMOND WASH. .	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS (TROPICANA/FLAMINGO WASH), NV..	1,215,000	741,000	474,000	---	410,000	---	260,000	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	40,500,000	2,040,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE								
(FDP)	ASHUELOT RIVER, NH	570,000	310,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MASCOMA RIVER, NH	545,000	310,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER VICINITY OF BEATTIES DAM, NJ	750,000	550,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	7,035,000	6,209,000	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER VICINITY OF CAMDEN, NJ (BECKETT STREET.	2,850,000	200,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	DEL RIV PHIL, PA - TRENTON, NJ SEC 201, 1976, TIOGA MA	1,890,000	50,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	HACKENSACK RIVER BASIN, NJ & NY	3,284,000	2,006,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	28,700,000	1,210,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK, NJ	11,900,000	250,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY IWW, MIDDLE THOROFARE HARBOR, NJ	440,000	---	---	100,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY IWW, OTTENS HARBOR, NJ	1,620,000	---	---	100,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(SP)	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, NJ	1,990,000	250,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(N)	NY HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS PORT JERSEY CHANNEL(DEEP	8,400,000	800,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(SP)	PASSAIC RIVER EAST BANK STABILIZATION, NJ	600,000	450,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ	1,170,000,000	750,000	---	3,900,000	---	3,900,000	---	3,900,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	6,000,000	694,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	154,000,000	4,696,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	11,600,000	---	---	250,000	---	125,000	---	250,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM (EMERGENCY GATES), NM......................	2,780,000	150,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FDP)	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS FLOODING............................	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LAS CRUCES, NM, EL PASO AND VICINITY..................	970,000	---	370,000	---	185,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	ROSWELL, PECOS RIVER, NM................................	515,000	415,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO..................	7,310,000	7,024,000	286,000	---	286,000	---	286,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,.	25,800,000	990,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	NEW YORK								
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INL-NORTON PT. NY.....	24,700,000	1,050,000	---	300,000	---	450,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	BUFFALO METRO AREA, NY.................................	2,840,000	2,720,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY...............................	1,000,000	400,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY..................................	900,000	600,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MOOSE AND BLACK RIVERS, NY.............................	540,000	385,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY......................................	6,680,000	700,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CNTY STREAMS, SHELDRAKE R TWN OF MAMARONEC	2,625,000	325,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC-LONG BEACH PORTION.......	36,800,000	391,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	CAPE FEAR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC...........	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC.........	1,602,000	1,379,000	223,000	---	373,000	---	373,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC...............................	490,000	465,000	25,000	---	25,000	100,000	25,000	---
	NEW HANOVER COUNTY BEACHES, KURE BEACH/FT FISHER, NC..	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
	NEW HANOVER COUNTY BEACHES, WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC....	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC.............................	21,300,000	---	---	331,000	---	165,000	---	165,000
(BE)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC...............	8,110,000	---	---	200,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC...	8,480,000	760,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND..	790,000	---	310,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	OHIO								
	LAKE ERIE - OHIO RIVER CANAL, OH & PA	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	2,100,000	615,000	---	85,000	---	85,000	---	85,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, OH, KY & IN	1,120,000	600,000	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
	MUSKINGUM RIVER WATERWAY	100,000	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	TRUMBALL COUNTY, OH	350,000	---	150,000	---	75,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER, OH	419,000	237,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	23,163,000	191,000	---	700,000	---	800,000	---	700,000
	OKLAHOMA								
	BIG AND LITTLE SALLISAW CREEKS, OK	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
	BROKEN BOW LAKE REREGULATION DAM, OK	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
(FDP)	CRUTCHO CREEK, OK	640,000	250,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	10,400,000	807,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(FDP)	KEYSTONE DAM TO TULSA, ARKANSAS RIVER, OK	640,000	250,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	MIAMI, OK & VICINITY	1,040,000	468,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH CANADIAN RIVER ABOVE LAKE OVERHOLSER, OK	480,000	349,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
	OREGON								
	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	2,528,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	700,000	---
(N)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION)	538,000	400,000	103,000	---	103,000	---	103,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR	518,000	128,000	160,000	---	80,000	---	160,000	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OR	3,562,000	3,255,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN (SYSTEM), OR	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FDP)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA- REALLOCATION	180,000	68,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN FLOOD WARNING & RESPONSE SYS, PA	---	---	---	---	60,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA	1,260,000	975,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	8,967,000	8,517,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA - REALLOCATION	620,000	50,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	6,300,000	286,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, PA	385,000	100,000	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN (FLOOD DAMAGE PREV), PA, NY, &	337,000	29,000	176,000	---	176,000	---	176,000	---
	WYOMING VALLEY (FABRIC DAM), PA	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA	127,000,000	4,792,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	432,000	332,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	GUAYANES, LAS MAREAS & GUAYANILLA HARBORS, PR	355,000	---	135,000	---	67,000	---	67,000	---
(FDP)	GUAYANILLA RIVER BASIN, PR	430,000	195,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	34,100,000	---	---	700,000	---	350,000	---	700,000
(FDP)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	445,000	100,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	161,500,000	3,798,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	55,100,000	---	---	500,000	---	250,000	---	500,000

Seward AK, Flood Prevention Study.—The Committee is informed that the flood diversion tunnel which protects the city of Seward, AK, has deteriorated significantly. In order to address this critical situation, the Committee has provided $150,000 for the Seward flood damage prevention investigation, and directs the Corps of Engineers to undertake a feasibility study to address the repairs and improvements needed.

West Memphis, AR.—The Committee is aware of efforts by the Corps of Engineers and the city of West Memphis, AR, to develop a flood control project with reduced costs which can be cost shared by the city. In addition, the Committee understands that the Corps is also trying to determine if the improvements of a reduced project can be provided in conjunction with measures that may be required as part of the West Memphis berm project a component of the mainline Mississippi River levee system.

In an effort to resolve the flooding situation, the Committee has included language in the bill which would require the Corps to develop the most cost-effective flood control plan for the city without regard to frequency of flooding, drainage area, and the amount of runoff. Further, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to proceed with implementation of protection measures on an expedited basis using optimum planning, engineering, design, and construction schedules, including concurrent construction with repairs to the mainline Mississippi River levees if feasible.

Sacramento River flood control project (Glenn Colusa Irrigation District), CA.—The Committee concurs with the House and has included language in the bill under general provisions directing the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction of facilities to restore the riverbed gradient of the Sacramento River in California in the vicinity of the Glenn Colusa Irrigation District's intake channel at mile 206.

In addition, the Committee has provided a total of $500,000 in the bill for engineering and design of the project, and directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with this important project as quickly as possible.

Mayo's Bar Lock and Dam.—The Committee is aware of and supportive of the Mayo's Bar Lock and Dam rehabilitation project by local interests on the Coosa River in Floyd County, GA. Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to provide in-kind technical assistance to the local sponsors of this project.

Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, Duck Creek, including Blue Diamond Wash, NV.—An appropriation of $300,000 is provided to complete a reconnaissance study of flooding and related water resource problems along Duck Creek, including Blue Diamond Wash, Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, Nevada. This study will evaluate prior findings, particularly in view of significantly revised technical data to determine if there is a likely solution to the problem that is in the Federal interest.

Lower Truckee Reconnaissance Study, NV.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control and erosion control needs, fish and wildlife habitat improvements, and modifications in the structures and operation of previously completed projects to improve the quality of the environment for the Lower Truckee River in Nevada.

Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout, NC.—The Committee has provided $373,000, the same as the House of Representatives, for the Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout, NC, study for fiscal year 1990. The amount recommended is $150,000 over the budget request and is to be used for basic hydrologic, water quality, and land use studies as part of the Albermarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study Program. The Committee understands that EPA has designated the Albermarle-Pamlico estuary system as an estuary of national significance, and the expertise of the Corps will be essential in addressing the long-term needs for the area.

South Carolina Shores, SC.—The Committee has included $300,000 for the South Carolina shores study. Within the amount budgeted for this effort, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to work cooperatively with the South Carolina Coastal Council and use up to $120,000 of this amount to initiate collection of beach monitoring profiles along the coast of South Carolina.

Cypress Creek, TX.—The Committee is aware of recent flooding along Cypress Creek in Texas which has caused substantial damage and property loss. In response to these events, the Committee has included $250,000 in the bill and directs the Corps of Engineers to take appropriate action to expedite the engineering and design so that this project can move into construction at the earliest possible time.

Given the importance of this project to flood prevention in the area, the Committee urges the Secretary of the Army and the administration to provide budgetary support in future years.

Connecticut River Basin, Townshend and Ball Mountain Dams, VT.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for the Connecticut River Basin, Townshend and Ball Mountain Dams project in Vermont for the Corps of Engineers to begin the effort of identifying the fish passage facilities required, and determining the most feasible and cost effective method to address the problem of fish passage at the dams.

Flood Plain Management Services and Section 32 Technical Assistance to States.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,450,00 for flood plain management services and $3,750,000 for section 22 technical assistance to States. The amounts recommended for these programs represent an increase over the budget request of $2,500,000 and $1,250,000 respectively, but a decrease below the current 1989 funding level.

The Committee has had numerous requests to earmark the maximum $300,000 for technical assistance to several States. However, budgetary limitations and the requirement that the program be available to address the needs of all States, dictate that the Committee not earmark specific levels of funding. The Committee directs the Corps attention to the following States where there appears to be the need for additional assistance: Alabama, Colorado, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, and Virginia.

Research and development.—The Committee recommendation for research and development activities of the Corps of Engineers totals $26,500,000, the full amount requested for fiscal 1990. This appropriation includes $4,000,000 for the Construction Productivity

Advancment Research Program [CPAR] authorized by section 7 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988.

CPAR is a cost-shared partnership between the Corps, the U.S. construction industry (contractors, equipment and material suppliers, architects, engineers, financial organizations), academic institutions and other groups who are interested in construction productivity and competitiveness. CPAR was created to help the construction industry regain its competitive edge nationally and internationally by building on the foundation of the existing Corps construction R&D program and laboratory resources through an expansion and leveraging effect that cost-shared partnerships provide. The objective of CPAR is to facilitate research, development, and application of advanced technologies through cooperative R&D, field demonstration, licensing agreements, and other means of technology transfer. Advancing the productivity and competitiveness of the U.S. construction industry will provide savings in construction costs for the Government and U.S. industries, and result in a boost to the U.S. economy in general.

R&D and technology transfer under CPAR will be based on problems defined in the Corps R&D program and suggested topics from the construction industry which can be addressed effectively by a partnership, with benefit to both the Corps and the industry. Features which distinguish CPAR from other cooperative programs with industry are the cost-sharing partnership arrangement, the ability of the Corps to act on ideas received from the industry, and the rapid reduction-to-practice of the R&D results through aggressive technology transfer and marketing actions.

The Committee feels that this program has great potential to benefit the Corps of Engineers construction program in addition to assisting the U.S. construction industry in the areas of productivity and competitiveness. Therefore, the Committee has no objection to the Corps of Engineers' proposal to reprogram $2,800,000 of currently available funds to begin the program in 1989 as outlined in the Assistant Secretary of the Army's letter of July 6, 1989, and subsequent communications regarding the source of funds.

Magnetic Levitation Transportation R&D.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 over the budget request for research and development activities for the Corps of Engineers to develop a detailed implementation plan for a magnetic levitation transportation test project.

Magnetically levitated and propelled vehicles can provide ground transportation at high speed that is energy efficient and environmentally sound. Magnetic levitation technology (Maglev) was invented in the United States, but is being developed abroad. U.S. strengths in superconductivity, composite materials, aerospace, and construction technology make it likely that a second generation U.S. Maglev system could have significant advantages over present, first generation foreign technologies.

The Committee recognizes that in the fiscal year 1989 conference report on the Transportation appropriations bill, the Federal Railroad Administration was directed to conduct an assessment of the current state of magnetic levitation technology including the economic and technical feasibility of constructing commercial systems in the United States. However, the Committee believes that now is an appropriate time to undertake the first phase of Maglev planning which will cost $4,500,000. The Secretary should consult with appropriate Federal agencies such as the Departments of Energy and Transportation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Committee believes the Corps of Engineers' engineering and project management skills uniquely qualify it to serve as the program manager for the U.S. Maglev pilot program, from the development of the implementation plan to the construction of an operational pilot system.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1989	$1,184,735,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,199,790,000
House allowance	1,217,912,000
Committee recommendation	1,124,070,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,124,070,000 for construction of water resource projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH, SC	7,570,000	284,000	---	216,000	---	216,000	---	400,000
(FC)	GILLS CREEK, SC	4,100,000	---	---	100,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	29,400,000	---	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	400,000
(SP)	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, SC	1,150,000	250,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	339,000	160,000	89,000	---	89,000	---	89,000	---
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER BASIN, SD	531,000	181,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILLION RIVER BASIN, SD	584,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	522,000	305,000	171,000	---	171,000	---	171,000	---
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE, TN	5,353,000	4,890,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK, TN	6,100,000	---	---	375,000	---	187,000	---	187,000
	TEXAS								
(FDP)	ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	490,000	290,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
(RCP)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	295,000	165,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FC)	BEAL'S CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	5,920,000	576,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX	128,200,000	---	---	500,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX (42-FOOT PROJECT)	21,100,000	995,000	---	307,000	---	307,000	---	307,000
(N)	BRAZOS RIVER DIVERSION CHANNEL, TX	710,000	475,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	CAMERON COUNTY, TX	1,570,000	1,340,000	86,000	---	86,000	---	86,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL COLORADO RIVER BASIN, COLORADO RIVER & TRIBS.	800,000	270,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	14,900,000	239,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	CYPRESS CREEK, TX	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000
(RCP)	DALLAS FLOODWAY, TX	345,000	235,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	DENISON DAM-LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	1,950,000	1,826,000	124,000	---	124,000	---	124,000	---
(FC)	FALFURRIAS, TX	16,400,000	---	---	200,000	---	100,000	---	200,000
(FC)	FIVE MILE CREEK, DALLAS, TX	14,400,000	150,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000
(FDP)	FT.BEND & BRAZORIA COUNTIES, BRAZOS RIVER & TRIBS, TX.	890,000	445,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX	82,000,000	---	---	500,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(RCP)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	1,750,000	350,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	142,100,000	---	---	700,000	---	350,000	---	700,000
(FC)	LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	139,000,000	---	---	350,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(SP)	MATAGORDA COUNTY SHORE, TX	540,000	---	160,000	---	80,000	---	160,000	---
(RCP)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	750,000	300,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	MC GRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	7,100,000	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---	300,000
(N)	PORT LAVACA TO RED BLUFF, TEXAS	370,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT, LA TO DANGERFIELD, TX.	---	---	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---
(FDP)	SAN BERNARD RIVER WATERSHED, TX	590,000	---	250,000	---	125,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	54,000,000	---	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	2,930,000	450,000	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	UTAH								
(FDP)	BEAR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT, ID & WY	1,000,000	600,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	5,020,000	---	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	WEBER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT	1,000,000	---	400,000	---	200,000	---	400,000	---
	VERMONT								
(SPEC)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN, TOWNSHED AND BALL MOUNTAIN DAMS	1,000,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
	VIRGINIA								
(RCP)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	300,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FC)	BUENA VISTA (LP), VA	28,500,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	700,000	200,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORTH FORK OF THE SHENANDOAH RIVER, VA	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN, VA	2,910,000	2,280,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, VA, HEADWATERS AREA	18,700,000	1,726,000	---	289,000	---	289,000	---	289,000
(FDP)	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA & WV	750,000	---	250,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	WAYNESBORO, VA	675,000	175,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	16,400,000	821,000	---	590,000	---	590,000	---	590,000
	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM MODIFICATION, WA	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE, WA	193,000	60,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	LACONNER, WA	---	---	---	---	---	62,000	---	125,000
(FDP)	LOWER SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	469,000	---	150,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	567,000	369,000	134,000	---	134,000	---	134,000	---
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA (EVERETT HARBOR)	359,000	125,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
	TRI-CITIES LEVEES MODIFICATION, WA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WV	67,065,000	191,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, WV	6,315,000	5,411,000	715,000	---	715,000	---	715,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER BASIN, WV	950,000	350,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	MOOREFIELD, WV	622,000	534,000	88,000	---	88,000	---	88,000	---
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	---	---	---	150,000	---	75,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	PETERSBURG, WV	655,000	613,000	42,000	---	42,000	---	42,000	---
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	---	---	---	500,000	---	250,000	---	500,000
	WEST VIRGINIA WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT STUDY, WV	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
	WISCONSIN								
(RCP)	FOX RIVER, WI	725,000	225,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	FOX RIVER CHANNEL GREEN BAY, WI	950,000	---	---	150,000	---	75,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	LA CROSSE, WI	565,000	250,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA, WI	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	5,100,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	NATIONAL STUDIES								
(SPE)	NATIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT DURING DROUGHT..............	500,000	---	500,000	---	250,000	---	500,000	---
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES..............	---	---	7,725,000	---	10,225,000	---	8,975,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION..........................	---	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEMS.............................	---	---	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES........................	---	---	4,950,000	---	9,900,000	---	7,450,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES.....................................	---	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES............................	---	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)......	---	---	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS..........	---	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY).................	---	---	570,000	---	570,000	---	570,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.................................	---	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
	TOTAL..			10,990,000	---	15,940,000	---	13,490,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT...............................	---	---	25,500,000	---	22,000,000	---	26,500,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.................			86,746,000	47,830,000	92,391,000	48,246,000	92,482,000	47,322,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	---	---	-8,468,000	---	-17,325,000	---	-8,718,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS....................			126,108,000		123,312,000		131,086,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(RDP)	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(RCP)	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA					
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,088,000	165,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
	FORT TOULOUSE, AL	1,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	258,550,000	26,454,000	2,196,000	2,196,000	2,196,000
	MOUND STATE PARK, AL	1,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE, AL	14,175,000	4,690,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL	31,965,000	2,391,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL	111,000,000	62,394,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
	ALASKA					
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	17,548,000	10,143,000	7,405,000	7,405,000	7,405,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ (STAGE 2)	237,000,000	132,796,000	28,400,000	28,400,000	28,400,000
	ARKANSAS					
	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,825,000	---	---	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	14,000,000	5,170,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR	571,500,000	554,934,000	7,700,000	8,100,000	7,700,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	256,000,000	228,847,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	84,200,000	---	---	4,000,000	2,000,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA	16,200,000	1,007,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	14,800,000	12,317,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE, CA	354,000,000	314,320,000	3,950,000	3,950,000	3,950,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA	13,400,000	10,055,000	2,945,000	2,945,000	2,945,000
	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	21,800,000	---	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	HANSEN DAM, CA	980,000	200,000	780,000	780,000	780,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	22,776,000	18,115,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	65,600,000	8,902,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	176,100,000	---	---	800,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	53,600,000	8,864,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA	51,900,000	7,135,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR), CA	4,160,000	720,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	12,400,000	3,009,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR).	102,225,000	75,595,000	1,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	96,500,000	80,665,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	21,600,000	3,853,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	147,700,000	54,908,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	32,100,000	10,658,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	1,018,000,000	23,888,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE-SUNSET-NEWPORT BEACH, CA	32,500,000	11,022,000	4,470,000	4,470,000	4,470,000
(FDP)	SWEETWATER RIVER, CA	92,560,000	20,280,000	---	---	5,000,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK, CA	63,100,000	59,482,000	3,618,000	3,618,000	3,618,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	23,200,000	11,717,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

Montgomery Point Lock, McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, AR.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system and also recognizes that the construction of a lock and dam at the system's entrance at Montgomery Point is essential for the navigation system to remain a reliable, efficient method of transportation for private and military cargo.

The Committee notes that since 1982, the Mississippi River has on four occasions fallen below the lowest recorded level established at the time the navigation system was built. This situation has led to extensive dredging, periods of use restrictions, and significantly longer transit times for barges; all of which are injurious to the system's users and costly to the Federal Government. Furthermore, the system has not met the requirements of Congress to provide a 9-foot minimum channel depth. This situation threatens the substantial Federal investment in the remainder of the navigation system and the accruing economic benefits.

The Committee acknowledges a recent decision by the Inland Waterways Users Board to recommend to the Congress that Montgomery Point Lock and Dam be constructed at full Federal expense. The Committee further notes that the construction account for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system remains open for the purpose of completing the final phase of this project.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to complete the ongoing Arkansas River Basin comprehensive study, and the planning and design for the lock at Montgomery Point at the earliest possible time.

Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR.—In 1988, the Congress provided funding to begin construction of the Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR, project under the section 205 program of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee directs that sufficient continuing funding be provided for the project in fiscal 1990.

Sweetwater River, CA.—The Committee has been informed that the legal issues delaying the Sweetwater River flood control project in California have been resolved and that construction on the project can now proceed. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use its reprogramming authority in 1989 to resume project construction. An amount of $5,000,000 has been included in the bill for fiscal year 1990 to continue construction.

Salmon River, Idaho (frazzle ice research).—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers has committed to provide funding under the section 205 program for continued testing of frazzle ice control structures on the Salmon River in Idaho. The Committee urges the Corps to complete the necessary studies as soon as possible in order to permit installation of an appropriate permanent ice control structure.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia.—The Committee has amended the House bill to provide that $7,850,000 shall be used by the Corps of Engineers to undertake both structural and nonstructural flood protection measures at Matewan, WV.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal 1990 also includes $2,700,000 for levee and floodwall construction, and structural and nonstructural work at Barbourville, KY; and $18,200,000 for the river diversion tunnel, and structural and nonstructural work at Harlan, KY. These are the amounts needed by the Corps of Engineers in 1990 for activities at these two locations.

Bonneville Lock and Dam, OR, dredge spoils.—The Committee has included bill language further authorizing the Secretary to dispose of surplus dredge material from the Bonneville Lock project at no additional cost to the Government to five public ports on the Columbia River, under certain terms and conditions. The Committee strongly endorses this disposal plan as a means of maximizing public benefits from the surplus material and in order to reserve other potential disposal sites for future use.

Columbia River Basin Fish Bypass Program.—The Committee strongly supports the program to install new and improved juvenile fish passage facilities at all the mainstem dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers as soon as possible. Given the importance of and the benefits to be derived from enhanced fish runs in the Columbia and Snake Rivers, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with fiscal year 1990 activities and again strongly urges the Secretary to place a higher budget priority on this work in fiscal year 1991 and beyond.

The Committee has provided additional funds totaling $9,900,000, the same as that provided by the House for design, testing, and construction of fish bypass facilities in the Columbia Basin. The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to obligate and expend these funds in fiscal year 1990 for the following activities: $4,100,000 to construct permanent gate raise modifications and improved collection and transport facilities at Little Goose Dam; $3,000,000 for permanent gate raise modifications, deflector screens, and an expansion of collection facilities at Lower Granite Dam; $1,600,000 for construction and testing of longer screens at McNary Dam; $100,000 to complete plans and specifications and begin construction of screens and a bypass system, which is expected to be completed by 1993, at Lower Monumental Dam; $100,000 for screens and bypass at Ice Harbor Dam; and $1,000,000 for screens and bypass at The Dalles project. The Corps may reallocate resources among projects as may be necessary subject to prior approval of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the House and Senate.

Cooper Lake and Channels, TX.—The Committee is cognizant of the House provision concerning the Cooper Lake and Channels project in Texas as it relates to the construction of recreation facilities. The Committee is also aware of conflicting assertions related to recreation development at the project and that there may be legal and cost-sharing issues which could be affected. Further, at a time when the budget request for 1990 presents a shortfall of $84,000,000 for ongoing operations and maintenance activities, including $34,000,000 for recreation facilities, budgetary implications are most important.

Therefore, in order to give full and careful consideration to the issues and arguments related to the Cooper Lake and Channels project, the Committee has stricken, without prejudice, the House language from the bill. This will allow the Committee sufficient time to gather additional facts in order to resolve the issue in conference with the House.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO....................................	95,400,000	94,644,000	756,000	756,000	756,000
(FC)	FOUNTAIN CREEK, PUEBLO, CO............................	6,210,000	5,174,000	1,036,000	1,036,000	1,036,000
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK, CO....................................	11,800,000	5,791,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.........................	10,000,000	3,704,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
	FLORIDA					
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL......................	872,000,000	330,435,000	24,500,000	24,500,000	24,500,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL................................	4,950,000	476,000	---	4,524,000	---
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.................................	156,000,000	70,887,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(BE)	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FL...............................	21,355,000	665,000	4,055,000	500,000	500,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL...................................	9,075,000	---	---	6,000,000	---
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL....................................	10,800,000	100,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL....................................	9,750,000	703,000	8,662,000	8,662,000	8,662,000
	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS, FL.............................	9,000,000	---	---	9,000,000	---
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT).................	5,550,000	---	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL...................................	22,000,000	10,600,000	3,700,000	3,800,000	3,700,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL...................................	17,900,000	437,000	---	4,067,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR BRANCH CHANNELS, FL......................	38,800,000	1,666,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
	GEORGIA					
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA......................	9,900,000	2,397,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC...............	555,000,000	487,300,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
	SATILLA RIVER BASIN, GA...............................	550,000	---	---	500,000	---
	HAWAII					
(N)	MAALAEA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MAUI, HI...................	5,960,000	405,000	---	600,000	600,000
	ILLINOIS					
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICTS, IL & MO......	96,645,000	90,371,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, MO.....................................	19,030,000	950,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	HARRISONVILLE & IVY LANDING LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 2, IL...	6,829,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO....................	743,500,000	627,868,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO.......	235,000,000	19,714,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL........................	18,400,000	6,097,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL..................................	15,000,000	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IL..........	6,900,000	5,494,000	1,406,000	1,406,000	1,406,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGT PROG, IL, IA, MO, WI..	154,158,000	14,343,000	14,860,000	16,000,000	14,860,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN..	50,400,000	34,340,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN..............................	61,700,000	1,245,000	---	2,400,000	2,400,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	IOWA					
(FC)	CLINTON, IA (DEF CORR)	335,000	---	335,000	335,000	335,000
(FC)	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT (DRAG), IA	8,637,000	1,514,000	249,000	249,000	249,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO	117,641,000	88,962,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	13,000,000	---	---	13,000,000	3,000,000
	KANSAS					
(FC)	GREAT BEND, KS	33,100,000	6,122,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
(FC)	HALSTEAD, KS	6,525,000	867,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	KENTUCKY					
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	63,450,000	59,529,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	92,690,000	82,568,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	100,385,000	79,011,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	17,091,000	12,779,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	453,000,000	222,975,000	39,898,000	39,898,000	39,898,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	70,700,000	54,571,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	517,000,000	90,518,000	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,270,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	137,000,000	9,617,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	179,000,000	75,018,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000
(FC)	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES INCLUDING BAWCOMVILLE	8,800,000	3,716,000	---	400,000	400,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST TAMMANY PARISH, LA	19,900,000	1,722,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,660,000,000	1,001,053,000	97,000,000	101,800,000	101,800,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	58,100,000	1,600,000	---	1,100,000	1,100,000
	MARYLAND					
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	38,800,000	2,600,000	---	8,200,000	8,200,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA (50-FT DEEPENIN	145,000,000	76,367,000	26,633,000	26,633,000	26,633,000
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(BE)	REVERE BEACH, MA	7,800,000	2,008,000	1,790,000	1,790,000	1,790,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	27,525,000	8,820,000	10,615,000	10,615,000	10,615,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN	26,900,000	12,134,000	8,700,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	23,200,000	2,961,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
	HEARDING ISLAND INLET, DULUTH HARBOR, MN	300,000	---	---	60,000	---
(FC)	ROCHESTER, MN	66,500,000	12,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
	ROSEAU RIVER, DUXBY LEVEE, MN	270,000	---	---	200,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN, MS	13,091,000	6,046,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	40,643,000	24,566,000	615,000	615,000	615,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	173,000,000	35,501,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU-JACKSON METRO AREA, MO	25,173,000	---	---	1,000,000	500,000
(FC)	HANNIBAL, MO	4,780,000	1,793,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	554,000,000	536,708,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	203,000,000	137,443,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
	TRIMBLE WILDLIFE AREA, SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,570,000	---	---	1,570,000	---
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	938,000	620,000	1,000,000	620,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	58,400,000	50,427,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	11,475,000	5,775,000	4,425,000	4,425,000	4,425,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	29,660,000	17,003,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	51,500,000	1,808,000	2,560,000	2,560,000	2,560,000
(FC)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ	152,000,000	---	---	250,000	250,000
(FC)	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	6,160,000	721,000	330,000	330,000	330,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	447,400,000	8,237,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT	54,000,000	30,500,000	---	---	1,900,000
	NEW MEXICO					
	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	42,600,000	---	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AT GALLUP, NM	5,000,000	3,341,000	1,659,000	1,659,000	1,659,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT, NM	11,700,000	5,183,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	NEW YORK					
	BUFFALO HARBOR DRIFT REMOVAL, NY	1,100,000	---	---	1,100,000	---
(N)	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	2,300,000	590,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	SMALL BOAT HARBOR, BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	11,600,000	1,000,000	---	5,300,000	5,300,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	63,700,000	23,516,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	140,000,000	136,988,000	3,012,000	3,012,000	3,012,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	16,300,000	9,089,000	330,000	330,000	330,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	168,000,000	152,078,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	HAMLET CITY LAKE, NC	3,200,000	---	---	3,200,000	---
(FC)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	11,239,000	1,597,000	830,000	830,000	830,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LK ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM, SHEYENNE R, ND (DAM SAFET	40,300,000	2,431,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	48,400,000	4,513,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND	82,700,000	40,702,000	10,220,000	10,220,000	10,220,000
	OHIO					
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	158,524,000	79,588,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,700,000
(FC)	NELSONVILLE, OH	7,920,000	790,000	2,415,000	2,415,000	---
(FC)	RENO BEACH - HOWARD FARMS, OH	5,560,000	2,285,000	1,680,000	1,680,000	1,680,000
(FC)	SENECAVILLE LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFET	2,300,000	350,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, OK	102,000,000	8,980,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(FC)	PARKER LAKE, OK, MUDDY BOGGY CREEK	28,300,000	1,275,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	OREGON					
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	237,000,000	94,104,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	677,000,000	656,241,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	131,500,000	95,530,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	25,100,000	20,976,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR	51,200,000	1,220,000	---	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	29,600,000	24,897,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA (MODIFICATION)	21,200,000	8,899,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	---
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	168,000,000	23,096,000	25,600,000	25,600,000	25,600,000
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA	61,300,000	3,302,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	600,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &.	88,800,000	4,730,000	17,900,000	17,900,000	17,900,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	16,700,000	3,982,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	TAMAQUA, PA	10,530,000	1,950,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	17,301,000	15,798,000	715,000	715,000	715,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	313,000,000	210,652,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	89,500,000	16,007,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(MP)	COOPER RIVER SEISMIC MODIFICATION, SC	29,500,000	27,600,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	TEXAS					
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	53,200,000	8,220,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
(FC)	BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	15,700,000	8,657,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	130,000,000	74,710,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	110,900,000	63,882,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	58,500,000	19,218,000	13,300,000	13,300,000	13,300,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	184,600,000	184,249,000	351,000	351,000	351,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX	36,000,000	9,314,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	28,900,000	21,521,000	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	293,000,000	261,959,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	146,000,000	---	---	2,500,000	---
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	115,000,000	90,389,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON, TX	126,000,000	2,300,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX	40,400,000	24,930,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
(FC)	TEXAS CITY & VICINITY, TX	40,100,000	38,052,000	845,000	845,000	845,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	70,500,000	---	---	4,000,000	---
	UTAH					
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	32,700,000	14,895,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
	VIRGINIA					
	JAMES RIVER 35-FT CHANNEL (1962 ACT), VA	2,600,000	---	---	25,000	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	97,800,000	15,010,000	1,880,000	1,880,000	1,880,000
(FC)	RICHMOND, (LOCAL PROTECTION), VA	73,200,000	9,466,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	17,600,000	---	---	200,000	200,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA	395,000,000	379,136,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA (1986 WRDA)	43,600,000	3,230,000	---	13,000,000	8,000,000
	ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM, WA	17,100,000	---	---	100,000	100,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, LAKE BRYAN, WA	27,700,000	7,700,000	---	4,100,000	4,100,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK & DAM, WA	25,100,000	7,261,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	30,200,000	1,020,000	---	100,000	100,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMP, WA, OR, & ID	189,000,000	151,237,000	11,400,000	12,261,000	11,400,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	168,500,000	101,934,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	44,500,000	5,895,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, WA	60,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	336,000,000	108,248,000	78,900,000	78,900,000	78,900,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	721,700,000	206,320,000	25,000,000	56,000,000	51,200,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	216,000,000	202,566,000	13,434,000	13,434,000	13,434,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV	195,000,000	9,950,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	20,800,000
	WISCONSIN					
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI	26,400,000	7,876,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	ALTERATION OF BRIDGES..................................	---	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)........................	---	---	7,900,000	8,300,000	7,900,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)...........	---	---	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 1	---	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION................................	---	---	13,237,000	13,237,000	13,237,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)...................	---	---	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES..........	---	---	20,000	20,000	20,000
	INLAND WATERWAY USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES...........	---	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)..............	---	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)......................	---	---	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)....	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	---	---	-95,112,000	-119,862,000	-95,112,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED UNOBLIGATED BALANCES........	---	---	---	-200,000,000	-150,000,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL.....................			1,201,790,000	1,127,912,000	1,124,070,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection (Sec. 14).—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the Corps to undertake activities related to a streambank and channel stabilization project on the Santa Fe River downstream of the St. Francis Drive bridge in Santa Fe, NM.

Small Beach Erosion Projects (Sec. 103).—Within available funds, the bill includes $125,000 for the Corps to initiate the Carlsbad Beach, CA, erosion study.

Small Navigation Projects (Sec. 107).—The Committee is informed that the Corps of Engineers is currently drafting regulations which would prohibit noncoastal regions of the United States from being eligible to participate in the Small Navigation Projects Program.

The Committee wishes to point out that the legislation authorizing the program does not exclude any region of the country from participation in the benefits of this authority as long as they meet certain specific conditions contained in the law. Therefore, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to manage the program accordingly.

Small Flood Control Projects (Sec. 205).—Within available funds, the bill includes $100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete studies of the need for a flood warning system for Mohave County, AZ, particularly the community of Kingman, Lake Havasu City, and Bullhead City, AZ; and $225,000 for cost shared feasibility studies to address the flooding problems in Bisbee, AZ.

Alteration of Bridges.—The Committee has not provided the $2,000,000 included in the Corps of Engineers budget request for the Corps to assume responsibility of the Alteration of Bridges Program currently located in the Department of Transportation under the U.S. Coast Guard. Legislation to transfer responsibility has not been enacted and the Committee understands that funding has also been requested in 1990 in the Coast Guard budget to undertake the same activities.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Aquatic Plant Control Program included $150,000 for Eurasian milfoil control activities at Lake Champlain in Vermont and New York.

Reprogramming practices and procedures.—In the report accompanying the fiscal year 1988 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, the Committee reaffirmed the basic guidance which it had provided to the Corps of Engineers in 1957 on the reprogramming of construction funds. At the same time, on a 2-year basis, the Committee increased the Corps latitude in the reprogramming of such funds. The Committee believes that the test has established that the increased latitude allows for more responsive and timely action, reduces mandatory interest charges, and increases operating efficiency.

Therefore, the Committee permanently revises the guidance given to the Corps of Engineers in 1957 by incorporating this increased latitude.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1989	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

Funds currently available in this appropriation should be sufficient to meet anticipated needs in 1990. The Committee understands in the event of a major flood or coastal emergency, additional funds will be requested.

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane and shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption. In the event of a major flood or coastal emergency, additional funds will be requested.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1989	$337,980,000
Budget estimate, 1990	337,000,000
House allowance	342,186,000
Committee recommendation	335,970,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $335,970,000 for flood control activities along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Boeuf-Tensas Basin Comprehensive Study, AR.—The Committee is aware of the flooding, agricultural water supply and environmental problems that exist in southeast Arkansas as the result of recent torrential rains and flooding. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army is directed to assess these problems and develop a multipurpose flood control and comprehensive agricultural water supply plan for Chicot, Desha, Ashley, Drew, Lincoln, and Jefferson Counties. This study would be a continuation of the ongoing investigations for the Boeuf-Tensas Basin comprehensive study authorized by the resolution adopted May 10, 1988, by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives and expanded by the resolution adopted June 23, 1988, by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

Water Balance Study, Yazoo Basin, MS.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to complete the remaining phases of the water balance study for the Northwest Mississippi region. Timely completion of this study will enhance water resource conservation in the region through the development of accurate assessments of water supply and demand, and will provide conceptual alternatives to address future water resource needs.

Cache River Basin, AR.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers currently owns nearly 8,000 acres of bottomland hardwoods, including old-growth cypress and tupelo trees as part of the Cache Basin project in Arkansas. The Committee is informed that this land is not being managed with the intensity that a resource of this type should. Given the value of the bottomlands, the Corps is strongly urged to work closely with State and local interests to better manage and protect this natural resource, and should consider a cooperative management plan pending resolution of final disposition of the lands in question.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this account.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1989	$1,370,714,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,282,622,000
House allowance	1,382,081,000
Committee recommendation	1,396,104,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	$40,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1989	$1,370,714,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,282,622,000
House allowance	1,382,081,000
Committee recommendation	1,356,104,000

An appropriation of $1,396,104,000 is recommended.

The administration's fiscal year 1990 budget request for operation and maintenance activities of the Corps of Engineers proposed reductions totaling $84,000,000 resulting in the closure of over 600 recreation sites and the elimination of maintenance dredging of harbors with less than 25,000 tons of commerce. The 25,000 ton limitation affected 74 projects nationwide in 1990 and had the potential to impact over 500 additional projects in future years.

The Committee received communications from many Members of Congress, and a large number of State and local interests requesting restoration of the reductions. Further, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, after realizing the fire storm of opposition to the proposal, agreed to review the criteria and explore ways to achieve the funding reductions while staying within the President's funding request for O&M activities. Unfortunately, the outcome resulted in a situation where neither the Corps nor the Congress could know with any certainty what activities would be accomplished in 1990. More importantly, the Secretary's proposal would require the deferral of other operation and maintenance work into future years. If allowed to go forward in this way, the affect of shrinking budgetary resources and the increasing number of projects entering the O&M program would only make a bad situation worse in fiscal year 1991.

The recommendation set forth herein restores the $84,000,000 reduction proposed by the administration. However, in order to offset a portion to this increase, the Committee has included language in the bill to expand the authority of the Corps of Engineers to collect fees at recreation sites nationwide and to make those receipts available in fiscal year 1990.

The Committee fully recognizes the budget crises, yet believes that it is essential to provide adequate attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. It should be pointed out that OMB has reduced this area by $275,000,000 over the past 3 years below the amount needed to adequately address program needs. Meanwhile, the Corps has been completing projects and adding them to the operational inventory each year. In order to cope with this situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities. If the trend in deferred maintenance continues unabated, Corps managed national infrastructure will experience accelerating deterioration until failure occurs. The Committee finds this situation unacceptable.

As alluded to earlier, the Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert budgeted operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled work due to meet unforeseen emergency requirements.

Further, the Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch its scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and budgetary constraints reduce available resources, it is clear the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered in conjunction with efforts to optimize the use of the limited resources available, to maximum public benefits.

Therefore, the Chief of Engineers is directed to immediately initiate a study of the current operation and maintenance program and report back to the Committees on Appropriations within 12 months of the passage of this act. The study must evaluate the scope of operation and maintenance separately, and provide individual recommendations which will provide for the continued operation and maintenance of nationally essential, Corps operated and maintained infrastructure with appropriations held at the fiscal year 1990 level. This study shall look 10 years into the future and anticipate the increase in the number of projects to enter the O&M inventory.

The recommendations should consider: (1) reducing the cost of operating facilities by consolidating management and operations of sites and projects; (2) prioritization of nonproject programs accomplished under the "Operation and maintenance" account; (3) reduced hours of operations; (4) reducing costs of operation through employee reductions; (5) actively seeking non-Federal sponsors to take over the operation of existing facilities; (6) the sale or other disposition of lands not essential to operating the project; (7) increasing use of local community public service organizations to assist in spring cleanups, et cetera; and (8) partnership arrangements with local governments allowing shared responsibility of the project.

Finally, the Committee believes that it is essential that the Corps solicit active participation by State, local governments and other interested parties in conducting this study.

Bethel, AK.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers is working with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out emergency protection of the sheetpile breakwater at Bethel, AK. Extraordinarily high water in the Kuskokwim River has caused unexpected, rapid erosion of the toe of this breakwater. The Corps estimates a 50-percent chance of partial failure of the breakwater next spring if no action is taken this year. This threatens a federally built hospital and a fuel dock which serves more than 70 interior Alaska villages. Final planning for construction of a more permanent solution to this problem is funded in this bill, and the Committee encourages the Corps to exercise their existing emergency authority, in cooperation with FEMA, to address the current situation.

Heber Springs, AR.—With the construction of Greers Ferry Lake in 1961, the city of Heber Springs, AR, lost its water supply along the Little Red River. Since this time, the Corps of Engineers and the city of Heber Springs have been negotiating a reasonable amount of compensation for the city. The city has been getting water from Greers Ferry Lake in exchange for the water supply lost with its construction. The Committee directs the Secretary to allow for the free use of water currently withdrawn by the city on an average annual basis, and also to establish an amount to be used free of cost that will cover the reasonable growth of the city until the year 2000.

Oceanside, CA.—An amount of $2,600,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with operation, monitoring, and installation of phase II of the experimental sand bypass system at Oceanside, CA, in 1990. The Committee understands that the system has passed all initial tests and is operating more efficiently than anticipated by the Corps.

The Committee is aware that there could be a need for additional funds for operation of the sand bypass system in 1990 and directs the Corps of Engineers to apply funds appropriated for normal harbor dredging at Oceanside Harbor to operate the sand bypass system in the event that budgeted maintenance dredging funds are not needed in 1990.

Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, MD and DE.—Funds for rehabilitation of the St. George's bridge shall be available after the Corps of Engineers, with the State of Delaware officials and the Federal Highway Administration has developed a plan of action to minimize disruption of traffic over the canal.

Up to $5,000,000 shall be available to review the design developed by the State of Delaware of a new bridge in the U.S. Route 13 corridor at the site selected by the Department of Transportation of the State of Delaware. The funds are to be derived from operation and maintenance funds currently available for St. George's bridge unless the Corps of Engineers in conjunction with the State of Delaware and the Federal Highway Administration determines that these funds are needed for major rehabilitation.

Michigan City Harbor, IN.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to expedite work on environmental studies for future dredge spoil disposal areas in order to ensure channel dredging can be undertaken as needed.

Brewerton Channel, eastern extension, MD.—The Committee is aware of severe navigation problems in the Brewerton Channel, eastern extension of the Baltimore Harbor and Channels Federal navigation project. Further, the Committee understands that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has announced plans to address the problem, but it is not certain when work will begin.

The Committee feels that safety and operational considerations make it imperative that corrective measures be commenced immediately. Therefore, the Corps is directed to undertake this work in 1989.

Lake Sakakawea, ND.—Within the funds provided for the operation and maintenance of Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND, the Corps is directed to spend up to $500,000 to permanently extend boat ramps to ensure public access at Lake Sakakawea State Park and Lewis and Clark State Park due to extremely low lake levels.

City of Millington, TN, flooding.—The Committee urges the Memphis district of the Corps of Engineers to work with the city of Millington and the Chickasaw Basin Authority to alleviate the flood problems along Big Creek.

Great River Road bridge, TN.—Because of the record low stages on the Mississippi River caused by last year's drought, downcutting of the channels along the lower reaches of the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers resulted in the failure of the Great River Road bridge and its associated stream banks. The bridge spans the Obion River at the Dyer-Lauderdale County line approximately 1.5 miles from its mouth and the Mississippi River.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that a total of $9,000,000 will be required to repair the bridge and stabilize the banks of the river. The Committee is unable to appropriate these funds in the absence of authorizing language, but the Committee will carefully review this project when the work is authorized.

Utilization of land surrounding Corps lakes.—The Committee understands that consideration is being given to increased private and commercial use of land surrounding Federal water resource development projects of the Army Corps of Engineers, particularly sites at 10 Oklahoma lakes. The Committee believes that the Corps should continue to review proposals of this nature, giving full consideration to authorized project purposes.

Jackson Hole, Snake River, WY.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is currently engaged in evaluation studies to determine the scope of operation and maintenance efforts for the Jackson Hole, WY, project that can be justifiably carried out by the Corps pursuant to the authorization contained in section 840 of Public Law 99-662.

The Committee is concerned, however, that failure to budget for accomplishment of Federal operations and maintenance pending outcome of the ongoing studies may result in unacceptably lengthening the period of time local interests would suffer potentially inadequate or undependable project protection. Therefore, the Committee has provided $400,000 for project operation and maintenance, so that, if the ongoing studies result in a favorable recommendation, there will be no delay in undertaking efforts found advisable.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—the need for additional funds for a cooperative program with the State of West Virginia to remove debris from the Kanawaha River.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1989.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
	SURVEYS:				
	GENERAL STUDIES:				
(FDP)	BOEUF TENSAS BASIN, COMPREHENSIVE STUDY...........	300,000	---	---	300,000
(FDP)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR.	2,620,000	209,000	209,000	209,000
(FC)	HELENA ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR..................	12,000,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	WEST MEMPHIS ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR............	11,700,000	138,000	138,000	138,000
(FC)	WHITEMANS'S CREEK, AR.............................	10,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FDP)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER AND LAND RES), LA........	6,570,000	64,000	64,000	64,000
(FDP)	YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS.............................	9,550,000	39,000	39,000	39,000
(FDP)	BIRDS POINT, NEW MADRID ALTERNATE STUDY, MO.......	1,350,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER MO. & AR. (FISH AND WILDLIFE)...	1,060,000	---	50,000	50,000
(FC)	HARRIS FORK CREEK, TN & KY........................	13,400,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA..................	---	270,000	270,000	270,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER (BIG CREEK AND TRIBS), AR.......	39,500,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS...............		2,400,000	2,450,000	2,750,000
	CONSTRUCTION				
(FC)	CACHE RIVER BASIN, AR..................................	139,000,000	227,000	227,000	227,000
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN......	3,158,000,000	95,200,000	95,200,000	95,200,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR..................................	9,830,000	736,000	736,000	736,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR....................	43,900,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	L'ANGUILLE RIVER, AR..................................	15,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS......	69,000,000	---	500,000	500,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	1,280,000,000	24,400,000	24,400,000	24,400,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA..........................	64,500,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	4,650,000
(FC)	ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO............................	395,000,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(0)	(6,700,000)	(6,700,000)	(6,700,000)
(FC)	RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA............................	163,600,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.................................	1,454,000,000	32,800,000	32,800,000	32,800,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA................	148,800,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000
(FC)	SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE).................	30,600,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,106,755,000)	(37,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(37,500,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER..	239,000,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER................................	103,000,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL......................	45,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM..	---	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES..	201,500,000	10,545,000	10,545,000	10,545,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS.................................	360,427,000	3,230,000	3,230,000	3,230,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS.............................	14,300,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.......................	110,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION...............................		234,463,000	234,963,000	234,963,000
	MAINTENANCE				
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, LA, MS, MO & TN..........	---	61,535,000	61,535,000	61,535,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR................	---	657,000	657,000	657,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR................	---	830,000	830,000	830,000
(FC)	MISS RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN.........	---	7,422,000	7,422,000	7,422,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO......................	---	8,504,000	8,504,000	8,504,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA..........	---	1,728,000	1,728,000	1,728,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR............................	---	827,000	827,000	827,000
(FC)	LAKE NO. 9 PUMPING PLANT, KY.........................	---	25,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA................................	---	7,147,000	7,147,000	7,147,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA.................	---	160,000	160,000	160,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBS, LA...........................	---	120,000	120,000	120,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA.....................................	---	706,000	706,000	706,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA..............	---	147,000	147,000	147,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA..	---	4,871,000	4,871,000	4,871,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA................	---	1,525,000	1,525,000	1,525,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO..................................	---	2,783,000	2,783,000	2,783,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS................................	---	182,000	182,000	182,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.................................	---	171,000	201,000	171,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(0)	(16,003,000)	(20,609,000)	(20,609,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE.......................................	---	2,506,000	2,866,000	2,866,000
(FC)	BACKWATER..	---	465,000	465,000	465,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER..	---	94,000	94,000	94,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE..	---	2,514,000	3,965,000	3,965,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD..	---	595,000	595,000	595,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE...	---	3,375,000	5,041,000	5,041,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM..	---	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE..	---	2,741,000	3,870,000	3,870,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES	---	1,601,000	1,601,000	1,601,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN	---	461,000	461,000	461,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY	---	286,000	286,000	286,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,138,000	1,138,000	1,138,000
(FC)	MAPPING	---	783,000	783,000	783,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		118,514,000	123,150,000	123,120,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-18,377,000	-18,377,000	-24,863,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.		337,000,000	342,186,000	335,970,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:

(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(N)	NAVIGATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	4,708,000	4,751,000
APALACHIACOLA BAY, AL	29,000	29,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	12,264,000	12,562,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT), AL	3,921,000	5,262,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	2,679,000	2,953,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	6,695,000	9,161,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	2,421,000	2,608,000
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	16,858,000	19,733,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,379,000	6,694,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,643,000	1,643,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	944,000	944,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	---	391,000
HOMER SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	426,000	426,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	---	256,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	433,000	433,000
OLD HARBOR, AK	---	40,000
STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING, AK	---	18,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO DAM, AZ	678,000	678,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	632,000	632,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	55,000	55,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	9,273,000	9,644,000
BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	3,368,000	3,756,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	776,000	823,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	3,717,000	4,517,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,201,000	4,404,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	2,890,000	2,890,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	687,000	753,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	663,000	706,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	798,000	840,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	3,885,000	4,155,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	447,000	447,000
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	19,704,000	20,366,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,606,000	1,783,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	2,275,000	2,519,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	846,000	897,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	2,398,000	3,794,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	560,000	560,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,925,000	5,714,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	2,956,000	3,052,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,275,000	2,275,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,274,000	1,409,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H.V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,021,000	1,131,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	---	3,604,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM - LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	1,967,000	2,077,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	1,415,000	1,415,000
DANA POINT HARBOR, CA	---	143,000
DRY CREEK - WARM SPRINGS LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	1,849,000	1,989,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	129,000	129,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,069,000	1,194,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	2,364,000	2,364,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,733,000	1,953,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,521,000	2,521,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	930,000	930,000
MARINA DEL REY, CA	---	135,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	122,000	122,000
MOJAVE RIVER RESERVOIR, CA	118,000	118,000
MORROR BAY HARBOR, CA	---	2,126,000
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	607,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,189,000	1,319,000
NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	635,000	635,000
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	---	1,255,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	1,734,000	1,734,000
OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	---	2,600,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	---	775,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	1,200,000	1,200,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,411,000	1,561,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,056,000	2,056,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER - SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	75,000	75,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	670,000	670,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER - 30' CHANNEL, CA	610,000	610,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,713,000	1,713,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,290,000	2,290,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	1,937,000	1,937,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,063,000	1,063,000
SAN LEANDRO MARINA, CA	---	859,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,737,000	1,737,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,737,000	1,737,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	---	965,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,079,000	1,229,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	1,354,000	1,354,000
SUISUN CHANNEL (SLOUGH), CA	---	813,000
TERMINUS DAM - LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,031,000	1,361,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	1,554,000	1,554,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	25,000	25,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	434,000	434,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,047,000	1,047,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	798,000	798,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,377,000	1,377,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	573,000	573,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	267,000	267,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	188,000	188,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, CT	1,048,000	1,048,000
GUILFORD HARBOR, CT	---	502,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	197,000	197,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	672,000	672,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	320,000	320,000
NORTH COVE (CONNECTICUT RIVER), CT	---	582,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	157,000	157,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	405,000	405,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	319,000	319,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	340,000	340,000
DELAWARE		
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	---	835,000
IWW, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	17,000	17,000
IWW, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE	18,596,000	18,596,000
IWW, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	---	833,000
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	177,000	177,000
WATERWAY FROM INDIAN RIVER INLET TO REHOBOTH BAY, DE	---	130,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	7,222,000	7,222,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	500,000	500,000
POTOMAC BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	1,000,000	1,000,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	21,000	21,000
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,408,000	3,408,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN, FL	5,249,000	5,249,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	1,027,000	1,027,000
CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	1,816,000	1,816,000
ESCAMBIA-CONECUH RIVERS, FL	793,000	793,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	805,000	805,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	495,000	495,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R. TO ANCLOTE R.	791,000	791,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	1,785,000	1,785,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	2,298,000	2,298,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,643,000	4,787,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	8,000	8,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	308,000	308,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,015,000	2,015,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	63,000	63,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,011,000	1,011,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	520,000	520,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	1,080,000	1,080,000
PONCE DE LEON, FL	---	70,000
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	529,000	529,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,835,000	2,835,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	2,516,000	2,516,000
GEORGIA		
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE & FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & F	4,936,000	5,002,000
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,712,000	5,439,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT), GA	1,105,000	1,105,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,702,000	3,702,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	5,011,000	6,172,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	2,568,000	2,841,000
J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	9,032,000	10,784,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	7,029,000	7,439,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	3,835,000	3,899,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	5,578,000	5,578,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	307,000	307,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,029,000	4,249,000
HAWAII		
BARBER'S POINT HARBOR, HI	50,000	50,000
HILO HARBOR, HI	403,000	403,000
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	532,000	532,000
KAHULUI HARBOR BREAKWATER, HI	541,000	541,000
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	934,000	934,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,686,000	4,686,000
DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR, ID	7,199,000	7,446,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	760,000	835,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL	1,132,000	1,132,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	2,595,000	3,064,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	1,595,000	1,595,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	881,000	881,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	147,000	147,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (LMVD PORTION)	1,600,000	1,600,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	15,333,000	15,333,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,517,000	1,517,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	3,651,000	4,792,000
MISS RVR BTWN MISSOURI RVR & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI	46,657,000	46,657,000
MISS RVR BTWN MISSOURI RVR & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN (LMVD	9,623,000	9,623,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,206,000	4,098,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,775,000	1,775,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	593,000	598,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	13,000	13,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	165,000	165,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	610,000	614,000
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	655,000	658,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	524,000	527,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	600,000	600,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	192,000	1,187,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	522,000	525,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	570,000	580,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	470,000	473,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	444,000	454,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,409,000	2,662,000
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	50,000	50,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,878,000	6,878,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,217,000	1,364,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	2,769,000	2,971,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,718,000	4,120,000
SIOUX CITY, IA	---	5,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,212,000	1,330,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	710,000	873,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	566,000	566,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	675,000	675,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	807,000	862,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	609,000	609,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,322,000	1,409,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	2,046,000	2,104,000
MARION LAKE, KS	723,000	811,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,191,000	1,334,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,107,000	2,263,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	974,000	1,024,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,677,000	1,837,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,061,000	1,198,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	315,000	315,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,620,000	1,684,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,038,000	1,158,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	5,024,000	5,479,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,003,000	1,204,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,000,000	1,000,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	682,000	739,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	914,000	961,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	601,000	621,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	967,000	1,012,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	938,000	988,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	686,000	746,000
GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,137,000	1,137,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,023,000	1,155,000
HICKMAN HARBOR, KY	497,000	497,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,297,000	1,297,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	715,000	734,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	13,000	13,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	616,000	616,000
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	37,000	37,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,001,000	1,147,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	47,026,000	47,026,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	4,319,000	4,319,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	726,000	726,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,006,000	1,116,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	673,000	693,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	3,305,000	3,381,000
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	300,000	300,000
LOUISANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	4,320,000	4,320,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	948,000	948,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	341,000	341,000
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA	370,000	370,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	38,000	38,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	460,000	460,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	126,000	126,000
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS, LA	4,450,000	4,450,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	760,000	760,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	11,550,000	11,575,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LA	2,280,000	2,280,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	209,000	209,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	63,000	63,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,350,000	1,450,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA.............	3,090,000	3,090,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	44,650,000	44,650,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA..................	6,100,000	6,100,000
PEARL RIVER, MS......................................	191,000	596,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,.	5,112,000	5,112,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA........................	1,500,000	1,500,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA.....................................	139,000	139,000
MAINE		
KENNEBEC RIVER, ME...................................	748,000	748,000
WELLS HARBOR, ME.....................................	---	1,137,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA..................	4,399,000	4,399,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREV. OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), MD..	415,000	415,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD.................	287,000	287,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS 50 FT, MD................	700,000	700,000
CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD.................................	---	600,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV......................	72,000	72,000
FISHING BAY, MD......................................	---	464,000
FISHING CREEK, MD....................................	---	450,000
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD..........................	---	850,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV......................	1,243,000	1,299,000
MUDDY HOOK AND TYLER COVES, MD.......................	---	500,000
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD...................	650,000	650,000
NEALE SOUND, MD......................................	---	505,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY, MD........	426,000	426,000
POCOMOKE RIVER, MD...................................	600,000	600,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD...................................	1,000,000	1,000,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA..................................	574,000	574,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA...................................	493,000	493,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA.................................	260,000	260,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA...................................	5,302,000	5,302,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA.........	150,000	150,000
CONANT BROOK DAM, MA.................................	143,000	143,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA..............................	433,000	433,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA...............................	250,000	250,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA..................................	394,000	394,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA.................................	441,000	441,000
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA..	273,000	273,000
TULLY LAKE, MA.......................................	448,000	448,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA....................................	276,000	276,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA...................................	287,000	287,000
MICHIGAN		
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI...................................	---	83,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI.......................	138,000	138,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI................................	24,000	24,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI....................................	3,835,000	3,835,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI.................................	197,000	197,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI...............................	656,000	656,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR,MI...............................	2,276,000	2,276,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI...................................	2,494,000	2,494,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI.....................................	11,000	11,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI................................	3,048,000	3,048,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI....................................	---	109,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI.................................	38,000	38,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI...............................	---	143,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI................................	---	406,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI............................	45,000	45,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI....................................	1,029,000	1,029,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI..................................	201,000	201,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI.................................	779,000	779,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI.................................	---	126,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI..............................	33,000	33,000
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI..............................	89,000	89,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI......................................	123,000	123,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,224,000	3,224,000
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	15,000	15,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,885,000	1,885,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,282,000	1,282,000
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	10,623,000	10,623,000
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	39,000	39,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	45,000	45,000
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	138,000	138,000
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,981,000	2,981,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	359,000	363,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	277,000	291,000
MISSISSIPPI R. BETWEEN MISSOURI & MPLS, MN	33,627,000	33,894,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	325,000	325,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	179,000	179,000
RED LAKE RIVER, MN	75,000	75,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	1,669,000	1,939,000
TWO HARBORS, MN	1,429,000	1,429,000
MISSISSIPPI		
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	70,000	70,000
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	400,000	400,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	---	146,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	394,000	394,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,954,000	2,954,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	164,000	164,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,035,000	1,232,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,730,000	2,730,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	376,000	376,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	274,000	274,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	368,000	368,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM & MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,448,000	4,905,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,037,000	2,297,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,238,000	8,509,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	805,000	805,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	559,000	559,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO & MISSOURI RIVERS,.	10,931,000	10,931,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,169,000	1,315,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,054,000	1,054,000
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	49,000	49,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	2,547,000	2,705,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	3,313,000	3,722,000
UNION LAKE, MO	4,000	4,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	100,000	100,000
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,348,000	4,491,000
LIBBY DAM, MT	4,217,000	4,217,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	4,125,000	4,225,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,073,000	1,178,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER, NE & SD	---	100,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	512,000	512,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	737,000	737,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	339,000	339,000
PINE-MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV	58,000	58,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	310,000	310,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	338,000	338,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	445,000	445,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
HAMPTON HARBOR, NH	---	308,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	869,000	869,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	309,000	309,000
RYE HARBOR, NH	---	460,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	482,000	482,000
NEW JERSEY		
ABSECON INLET, NJ	20,000	20,000
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	619,000
COHANSEY RIVER, NJ	---	1,235,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	200,000	200,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,820,000	1,820,000
DELAWARE RIVER - PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, PA, NJ & DE.	13,465,000	13,465,000
NEW JERSEY IWW, NJ	2,215,000	2,215,000
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	1,540,000	1,540,000
SHREWSBURY RIVER, NJ	---	1,050,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,147,000	1,147,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,557,000	1,640,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,078,000	1,078,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	159,000	159,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	303,000	303,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	661,000	661,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	275,000	275,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	303,000	303,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	157,000	157,000
BAYRIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	120,000	120,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,672,000	3,672,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,790,000	1,790,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	800,000	800,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	800,000	800,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	1,358,000	1,358,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	---	4,150,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	1,150,000	1,150,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	2,633,000	2,633,000
JONES INLET, NY	---	900,000
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	---	30,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,424,000	1,424,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY	82,000	82,000
NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	1,115,000	1,115,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY	2,810,000	2,810,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,187,000	4,187,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	600,000	600,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	395,000	395,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	912,000	912,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK PROJECTS, NY	2,568,000	2,568,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	414,000	414,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	4,180,000	4,180,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	933,000	964,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	354,000	354,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	---	675,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	708,000	770,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	---	264,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	---	107,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	923,000	923,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	---	535,000
MANTEO -SHALLOWBAG BAY, NC	---	5,186,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	1,825,000	1,825,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	---	538,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	---	681,000
OCRACOKE INLET, NC	---	278,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	---	40,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,722,000	2,847,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,464,000	4,464,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND	212,000	212,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	6,110,000	6,563,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	102,000	108,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	703,000	732,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	446,000	446,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	552,000	567,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	959,000	959,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,449,000	1,591,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	683,000	693,000
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	451,000	461,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	5,755,000	5,755,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	520,000	520,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	496,000	519,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	444,000	464,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	434,000	434,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	987,000	987,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	934,000	934,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,534,000	1,534,000
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	20,000	20,000
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR, OH	732,000	732,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	789,000	810,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER RESERVOIRS, OH	4,978,000	5,003,000
NEWARK LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	20,000	20,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	226,000	256,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	482,000	495,000
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	20,000	20,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	740,000	740,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	5,247,000	5,247,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	453,000	458,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	397,000	401,000
WEST HARBOR, OH	---	275,000
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	573,000	588,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	391,000	391,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	14,000	14,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	676,000	752,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,428,000	1,465,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,502,000	1,639,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	816,000	863,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,367,000	3,501,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	2,597,000	2,697,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	704,000	745,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	425,000	444,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	510,000	511,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,128,000	1,236,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	563,000	727,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,329,000	1,421,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,327,000	2,452,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,305,000	1,426,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	476,000	531,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	9,000	9,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	718,000	742,000
ROBERT S. KERR L&D AND RESERVOIRS, OK	2,463,000	2,590,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	720,000	720,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,291,000	1,294,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	2,385,000	2,598,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	879,000	934,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,630,000	2,642,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	7,010,000	7,019,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	558,000	558,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	164,000	164,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM-LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR	11,277,000	11,277,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	472,000	472,000
C&LW RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR	11,221,000	11,221,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OR & WA	7,282,000	7,282,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR.	358,000	358,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	170,000	170,000
COOS BAY, OR	3,992,000	4,121,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	---	269,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	656,000	686,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	932,000	932,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,589,000	1,589,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	348,000	348,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	368,000	373,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	568,000	614,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,057,000	2,109,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	523,000	523,000
JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, OR	14,006,000	14,074,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,664,000	2,664,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,755,000	2,755,000
MCNARY L&D, OR	10,641,000	10,867,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	---	233,000
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	---	414,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	881,000	881,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	233,000	233,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,066,000	1,066,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	95,000	95,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	585,000	585,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	383,000	383,000
YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	1,486,000	1,486,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	5,946,000	5,946,000
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	417,000	417,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	148,000	148,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	582,000	582,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,370,000	1,370,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,057,000	1,117,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,138,000	1,245,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,122,000	1,416,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	428,000	428,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	520,000	520,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	886,000	926,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	497,000	497,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	588,000	588,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA	321,000	321,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	6,000	6,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,033,000	1,091,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	797,000	847,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	582,000	604,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	11,315,000	11,315,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	335,000	335,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	5,000	5,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	1,947,000	2,260,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,400,000	1,400,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,983,000	2,222,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	229,000	229,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,904,000	1,979,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	855,000	987,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	275,000	282,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	620,000	649,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	1,180,000	1,180,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	1,366,000	1,628,000
RHODE ISLAND		
GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI	---	201,000
HARBOR OF REFUGE, BLOCK ISLAND, RI	---	200,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	3,261,000	3,261,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,701,000	3,701,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,297,000	3,297,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	---	469,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,892,000	1,892,000
JEREMY CREEK, SC	---	20,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC	---	672,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC	---	141,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	827,000	827,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	600,000	600,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	---	407,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	5,148,000	5,249,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	168,000	182,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	149,000	158,000
FT. RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	6,278,000	6,666,000
OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,071,000	8,545,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	2,556,000	2,776,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	3,518,000	3,640,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	2,543,000	2,696,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	2,605,000	2,711,000
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	1,553,000	1,703,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	3,969,000	4,164,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	12,614,000	12,614,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	657,000	657,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	792,000	792,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	760,000	760,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	838,000	1,056,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	1,814,000	1,974,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,191,000	1,305,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,745,000	1,745,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,528,000	1,528,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	1,022,000	1,244,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	1,110,000	1,110,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	525,000	525,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,890,000	4,890,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	3,887,000	4,157,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	8,000	8,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	1,655,000	1,813,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	1,100,000	1,100,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	45,000	45,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	860,000	950,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,357,000	1,397,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	15,779,000	15,779,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	605,000	720,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,510,000	5,510,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	556,000	556,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	156,000	156,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	1,899,000	2,017,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	1,909,000	2,030,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,460,000	1,460,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,020,000	1,093,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	952,000	1,065,000
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	732,000	901,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	886,000	1,081,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,027,000	1,203,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	551,000	551,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	3,125,000	3,125,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,578,000	2,749,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	1,344,000	1,682,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,102,000	1,237,000
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX	1,725,000	1,725,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM - B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,305,000	1,369,000
TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	20,000	20,000
WACO LAKE, TX	1,532,000	1,697,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	225,000	225,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,654,000	2,860,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,389,000	1,645,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	365,000	365,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	419,000	419,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	348,000	348,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	444,000	444,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	441,000	441,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	1,849,000	1,849,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC , VA	464,000	464,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	100,000	100,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	817,000	817,000
DEEP CREEK, VA	---	687,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	954,000	954,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR(DRIFT REMOVA	200,000	200,000
HORN HARBOR, VA	---	142,000
HOSKINS CREEK, VA	---	640,000
JAMES RIVER NAVIGATION, VA	1,537,000	1,537,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,574,000	5,837,000
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	889,000	979,000
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	---	692,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	3,280,000	3,280,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	500,000	500,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	388,000	388,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	1,478,000	1,539,000
RUDEE INLET, VA	---	880,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,095,000	1,095,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,160,000	1,160,000
WASHINGTON		
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	57,000	57,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	9,664,000	9,664,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA	---	441,000
ELOCHOMAN SLOUGH, WA	65,000	65,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	130,000	130,000
FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	16,000	16,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	4,889,000	4,889,000
HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	978,000	978,000
ICE HARBOR L&D, WA	4,466,000	4,643,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	4,144,000	4,144,000
LEWIS RIVER, WA	85,000	85,000
LITTLE GOOSE L&D, WA	3,891,000	3,891,000
LOWER GRANITE L&D, WA	5,015,000	5,069,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL L&D, WA	4,303,000	4,303,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	522,000	522,000
MT ST HELEN SEDIMENT CONTROL STRUCTURE, WA	95,000	95,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	5,146,000	5,146,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	670,000	670,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	550,000	550,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	91,000	91,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	522,000	522,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP, WA	38,000	38,000
TACOMA HARBOR, WA	28,000	28,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM - LAKE CELILO, WA	7,732,000	7,804,000
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	---	545,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WA	1,346,000	1,346,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	613,000	632,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	928,000	1,043,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,064,000	1,124,000
CHARLESTON RIVERFRONT	---	250,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	974,000	999,000
ELKINS, WV	12,000	12,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,765,000	7,765,000
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,324,000	1,364,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	682,000	682,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,003,000	1,063,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,194,000	1,269,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	626,000	641,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI....................................	261,000	261,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI.....................	326,000	351,000
FOX RIVER, WI...	1,124,000	1,124,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI..................................	914,000	914,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI - DIKE DISPOSAL..................	2,160,000	2,160,000
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI....................................	884,000	884,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI...................................	166,000	166,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI.....................................	31,000	31,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI..................................	157,000	157,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI..................................	987,000	987,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI..................................	367,000	367,000
STURGEON BAY, WI......................................	143,000	143,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE, SNAKE RIVER.............................	---	400,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM.............................	7,500,000	6,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.........................	6,257,000	6,257,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS..............	1,800,000	1,800,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)........	10,000,000	8,000,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS.............................	8,852,000	8,852,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS (S	50,000	50,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS.............................	1,000,000	1,000,000
RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE.....................	1,000,000	1,000,000
SCHEDULING OF FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS......	2,620,000	2,620,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS..............	2,500,000	2,500,000
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS........................	3,260,000	3,260,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE..........	-19,570,000	-33,570,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE................	1,282,622,000	1,356,104,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

Appropriations, 1989	$60,427,000
Budget estimate, 1990	69,427,000
House allowance	69,427,000
Committee recommendation	69,427,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $69,427,000 for fiscal year 1990 for general regulatory functions. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers General Regulatory Functions were formerly financed as part of the "Operation and maintenance, General appropriation" account. The appropriation recommended provides salaries, expenses and related costs to administer laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the River and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

In keeping with the President's stated policy of no net loss of wetlands, the Corps is urged to give higher priority consideration to pending and future permit applications for which a mitigation program has been proposed that meets or exceeds the goal of no net loss. Priority consideration should also be given to those applications pending for more than 12 months.

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	$23,000,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the revolving fund of the Corps of Engineers. This is $13,000,000 below the budget and $10,000,000 over the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation restores $10,000,000 of the House reduction for the Corps of Engineers automation plan. The Committee believes that from an economic and management standpoint, it is prudent to proceed with replacement of the outdated equipment presently being used by the Corps. The Committee further understands that failure to proceed with the automation plan at this late date will make the Government liable for bid preparation costs currently estimated at no less than $25,000,000. In addition, a delay in proceeding with the automation improvements will also require the Corps to move to commercial timesharing at a higher cost.

Therefore, the Committee has restored the funds so that the Corps can proceed with CEAP as planned.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$120,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	128,800,000
House allowance	127,300,000
Committee recommendation	128,800,000

An amount of $128,800,000 is recommended for general expenses of the Corps of Engineers, which is the same as the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division offices, the Board for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

Wetlands preservation.—The Committee is aware that President Bush has endorsed a national policy of no net loss of wetlands. This Committee supports efforts that will preserve the Nation's wetlands and has a history of adding funding in support of planning and construction for wetlands preservation, restoration and creation projects such as the Mississippi and Louisiana estuarine area project for which funds are provided in this bill.

The State of Louisiana contains 40 percent of the Nation's coastal wetlands, however, those wetlands are disappearing at the alarming rate of 50 square miles per year. The loss of those wetlands threatens the commercial and recreational fishing industries, could necessitate the relocation or rebuilding of Federal levee and navigation structures and other local infrastructure at a multibillion dollar cost and would have many other devastating impacts.

Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Secretary proceed as expeditiously as possible with a vigorous program to address the problems of Louisiana's and the Nation's wetlands. The Committee expects the administration to back up the stated no net loss policy with concrete actions.

Corps organizational structure.—The Committee fully recognizes the national importance and essential nature of the planning, design, construction, and operating programs managed and directed by the Corps of Engineers. Yet the Nation is facing economic and budgetary problems which must be resolved. The Corps has already been asked, and will be asked again in the future, to do more with less. Therefore, the Corps will need to examine every available opportunity to increase its efficiency and effectiveness in order to reduce its costs.

The Committee notes with some concern that despite significant changes in its mission, the technological and managerial revolution of the past 20 years, the significant shifts in the geographical dispersion of its work, and the substantial increase in the amount of reimbursable work it performs for other agencies, that the Corps has not seriously evaluated various alternative organizational structures which might be more efficient in a changing business environment. There have been several in-house studies, but for the most part, they were designed only to fine tune the current structure as opposed to a search for the optimum organizational structure. Primarily, these studies focused on the size of existing workloads rather than looking at the changing nature of the work or the possible future national challenges the Corps may be asked to address.

Accordingly, the Chief of Engineers is directed to initiate a broad based conceptual study of potential field organization structures that would respond to the following: (1) alternative structures which would reduce the program costs without adversely impacting the quality of service; (2) identification of factors and criteria for shaping an optimally efficient organizational structure; (3) identification of existing constraints which would interfere with the Corps implementation of an improved field structure; and (4) those factors, criteria, constraints, and alternative structures which must be considered and addressed to best position the Corps of Engineers to address this Nation's future engineering and environmental challenges.

The Committee again cautions the Chief of Engineers that this study is to be conceptual in nature only, and shall not suggest or recommend specific geographic changes to the existing organization nor shall the Corps make any such changes during the current fiscal year.

After completion of the study, it is the hope and expectation that the appropriate congressional oversight committees will then work closely with the Army to decide on specific reorganization proposals.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1989	$14,250,000
Budget estimate, 1990	11,550,000
House allowance	11,230,000
Committee recommendation	11,330,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,330,000, which is $100,000 over the House allowance.

Environmental and interagency coordination activities.—Within the amount recommended for environmental and interagency coordination activities, the Committee has included $250,000 for studies related to mine water treatment and related problems in the greater Leadville, CO, area, including technical oversight and support.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1989	$712,305,000
Budget estimate, 1990	644,307,000
House allowance	661,008,000
Committee recommendation	662,120,000

A new appropriation of $662,120,000 is recommended by the Committee.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1989	FY 1990 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
	CALIFORNIA					
PROJ.INV. M&I	INDIAN WELLS VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.............	525,000	155,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
ADV.PLNG. WQ	KELLOGG UNIT..	350,670	325,670	25,000	25,000	25,000
	OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION.........................	---	---	---	62,000	---
ADV.PLNG. MC	REFUGE WATER SUPPLIES.................................	550,000	---	25,000	13,000	13,000
ADV.PLNG. I	SAN JOAQUIN CONVEYANCE................................	179,375	154,375	25,000	137,000	137,000
	SANTA ANA WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STUDY....................	---	---	---	138,000	---
	COLORADO					
SP.INV. MP	HIGH MOUNTAIN AQUIFER STUDY.............................	633,342	603,342	30,000	30,000	30,000
	SOUTH PLATTE RIVER OPERATIONS STUDY.....................	---	---	---	38,000	38,000
PROJ.INV. MP	UPPER GUNNISON-UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN PROJECT...............	920,000	120,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	IDAHO					
SP.INV. M&I	TETON DAM REAPPRAISAL..................................	300,000	---	---	---	150,000
	KANSAS					
SP.INV. MP	ARKANSAS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY.....	990,000	150,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	MONTANA					
SP.INV. MC	FLATHEAD RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	495,000	---	95,000	48,000	48,000
	NEVADA					
PROJ.INV. M&I	NORTHERN NEVADA WATER AUGMENTATION PROGRAM.............	500,000	80,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
	OREGON					
PROJ.INV. MC	DESCHUTES RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT............	745,000	---	160,000	80,000	80,000
PROJ.INV. MP	JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY....	670,000	125,000	290,000	290,000	290,000
PROJ.INV. MP	NORTHERN DOUGLAS CO. COOP. WATER RESOURCES STUDY......	1,672,462	847,462	200,000	200,000	200,000
PROJ.INV. MP	UPPER JOHN DAY WATER OPTIMIZATION PROJECT.............	671,000	156,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
PROJ.INV. MP	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	543,000	93,000	190,000	190,000	190,000
	TEXAS					
SP.INV. MP	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN TOTAL WATER MGMT STUDY.....	650,000	50,000	200,000	200,000	200,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1989	FY 1990 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	UTAH					
SP.INV. MP	SEVIER RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY....................	440,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SP.INV. MC	UTAH AREA WATER DEMAND MODEL..........................	275,000	---	100,000	50,000	50,000
	WASHINGTON					
PROJ.INV. I	YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT..........	6,844,667	5,844,667	740,000	740,000	740,000
	WYOMING					
SP. INV. MP	SEMINOE DAM MODIFICATION.............................	653,819	553,319	100,000	100,000	100,000
	VARIOUS					
PROJ.INV. M&I	COLORADO RIVER RECHARGE STUDY..........................	280,000	150,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
PROJ.INV. WQ	COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.......	55,249,477	49,702,837	1,235,000	1,235,000	1,235,000
ADV.PLNG.	COLORADO RVR WATER QUAL IMPROV PGM, UINTA BASIN UNIT...	---	---	---	150,000	---
	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:					
SP.INV.	ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	4,797,895	1,828,895	2,969,000	2,969,000	2,969,000
SP.INV. MC	FOUR CORNERS WATER ASSESSMENT.......................	425,000	---	125,000	63,000	63,000
SP.INV.	GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES............................	8,488,506	1,943,506	775,000	775,000	775,000
SP.INV.	INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS..................	1,200,000	578,000	622,000	622,000	622,000
SP.INV.	MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS..............	755,000	311,000	444,000	444,000	444,000
SP.INV.	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES......................	2,485,739	915,739	1,570,000	1,570,000	1,570,000
SP.INV. WQ	TOXIC CONSTITUENT STUDIES...........................	1,865,000	---	200,000	100,000	100,000
SP.INV. I	UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION........	538,984	283,984	155,000	155,000	155,000
PROJ.INV. MP	VEGETATION MANAGEMENT ALONG THE COLORADO RIVER.........	375,000	150,000	150,000	---	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGES.........	---	---	-280,000	-599,000	-299,000
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS....................			11,550,000	11,230,000	11,330,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1989	FY 1990 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM					
	CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
	ARIZONA					
	HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT	48,500,000	28,870,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
	INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT -SAWRSA	22,793,000	---	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	CALIFORNIA					
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
	AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,123,244,000	344,933,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	662,838,000	636,282,000	7,850,000	7,850,000	7,850,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	363,314,000	306,566,000	6,325,000	6,325,000	6,325,000
	SAN FELIPE DIVISION	347,888,000	297,147,000	2,500,000	2,600,000	2,500,000
	SAN LUIS UNIT	1,338,883,000	553,815,000	5,428,000	5,428,000	5,428,000
	TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	299,691,000	264,915,000	12,280,000	12,280,000	12,280,000
	COLEMAN NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY	5,525,000	---	---	1,500,000	---
	COLORADO					
	GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	255,582,000	68,283,000	8,239,000	8,239,000	8,239,000
	LAS VEGAS WASH, TITLE II, CRBSCP	113,500,000	---	---	50,000	50,000
	LOWER GUNNISON BASIN WINTER WATER, TITLE II, CRBSCP	30,151,000	---	---	2,500,000	2,500,000
	PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	82,566,000	51,214,000	2,461,000	2,461,000	2,461,000
	SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION	94,000,000	78,805,000	7,755,000	7,755,000	7,755,000
	NEBRASKA					
	NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP	348,610,000	242,902,000	6,030,000	23,030,000	23,030,000
	O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP	173,200,000	8,493,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
	NORTH DAKOTA					
	GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,371,850,000	354,006,000	8,750,000	25,000,000	30,000,000
	OREGON					
	UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	45,730,000	---	---	650,000	650,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA					
	BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	48,500,000	11,057,000	6,765,000	6,765,000	6,765,000
	WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	110,630,000	96,326,000	14,304,000	15,229,000	14,304,000
	MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	87,500,000	---	---	500,000	500,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1989	FY 1990 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	WASHINGTON					
	COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
	IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,225,289,000	921,959,000	5,210,000	5,210,000	5,210,000
	THIRD POWERPLANT	750,000,000	735,858,000	11,153,000	11,303,000	11,153,000
	YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE & PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	39,763,000	39,363,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	WYOMING					
	BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	80,180,000	52,735,000	15,957,000	15,957,000	15,957,000
	VARIOUS					
	BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	54,170,000	10,994,163	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
	MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	483,527,000	349,394,000	19,060,000	19,060,000	19,060,000
	SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION			170,117,000	209,742,000	212,067,000
	DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
	ALL AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT, ARIZONA	2,400,000	1,840,000	560,000	560,000	560,000
	ARBUCKLE PROJECT	3,560,000	---	---	25,000	25,000
	BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	32,809,000	30,241,000	1,268,000	1,268,000	1,268,000
	BRANTLEY PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	139,661,000	136,375,000	3,286,000	3,286,000	3,286,000
	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT, WA.	88,594,000	81,946,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
	COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CO	156,113,000	65,131,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	8,400,000
	CULTURAL RESOURCES ACTIVITIES, MO, NE, MT, SD, WY	2,311,000	1,221,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	507,383,000	500,458,000	6,034,000	6,034,000	6,034,000
	GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA	78,115,000	76,495,000	830,000	830,000	830,000
	KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	53,974,000	43,607,000	1,898,000	1,898,000	1,898,000
	LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	14,345,000	3,974,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
	MCGEE CREEK, PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	110,397,000	107,627,000	2,770,000	2,770,000	2,770,000
	NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	31,053,000	7,025,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
	PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
	EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	23,438,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
	FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	43,036,000	41,459,000	460,000	460,000	460,000
	GLENDO UNIT, WYOMING	3,120,000	1,920,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	42,143,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
	OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,006,000	6,758,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
	VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	25,544,000	10,267,000	7,525,000	7,525,000	7,525,000
	WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	358,022,000	42,761,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
	WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	97,995,000	96,990,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000
	SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			43,471,000	43,496,000	43,496,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1989	FY 1990 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
	CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	50,000,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, LITTLE PANOCHE DAM, CA	7,200,000	274,000	225,000	225,000	225,000
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, LOS BANOS DAM, CALIFORNIA	14,400,000	77,000	675,000	675,000	675,000
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, O'NEILL DAM, CALIFORNIA	2,250,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
	COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	45,900,000	---	---	1,400,000	1,400,000
	DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	6,034,000	3,784,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
	HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	2,329,000	733,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
	INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	97,330,000	3,216,000	7,955,000	6,555,000	6,555,000
	MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	77,900,000	76,979,000	691,000	691,000	691,000
	MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	70,202,000	42,423,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, ARIZONA	68,381,000	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, ARIZONA	30,468,000	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	30,956,000	22,417,000	5,578,000	5,578,000	5,578,000
	SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TWIN BUTTES DAM, TEXAS	25,000,000	195,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
	SEEDSKADEE PROJECT, FONTENELLE DAM, CRSP, WYOMING	26,812,000	26,562,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
	WASHITA BASIN PROJECT, FOSS DAM, OKLAHOMA	500,000	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	6,001,000	2,319,000	470,000	470,000	470,000
	SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS			29,284,000	29,284,000	29,284,000
	REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
	HIGHLAND-HANOVER DIV, HANOVER-BLUFF UNIT, WY	300,000	---	---	150,000	150,000
	HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	1,440,000	150,000	1,101,000	1,101,000	1,101,000
	MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT	2,050,000	---	---	100,000	100,000
	MILK RIVER, MALTA DIVISION, MT	5,600,000	---	---	250,000	250,000
	OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UTAH	11,750,000	---	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
	UPPER BLUFF DIVISION, HANOVER-BLUFF UNIT, WY	220,000	---	---	110,000	110,000
	WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	9,900,000	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT			4,251,000	4,861,000	4,861,000
	APPLIED ENGINEERING:					
	GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	21,046,000	3,507,000	7,323,000	7,323,000	7,323,000
	PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING & SCIENTFIC STUDIES	158,012,000	83,118,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
	SUBTOTAL, APPLIED ENGINEERING			11,823,000	11,823,000	11,823,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			258,946,000	299,206,000	301,531,000

Animas-La Plata project, Colorado and New Mexico.—Last year, the Congress passed and the President signed into law the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. The settlement agreement was achieved after 10 years of litigation and 4 years of intense negotiation by the Indian tribes of Colorado and New Mexico, numerous municipalities and conservancy districts, the Department of Justice, and the Department of the Interior.

The water adjudicated to the Ute Indians is to be stored in the reservoir created by the Animas-La Plata project. The cost-sharing agreement required by the Federal Government is in place and Colorado is ready to escrow $30,000,000 in support of the project.

However, the fiscal 1990 budget includes only $3,700,000 to bring activities on the project to a "reasonable conclusion." Given the efforts of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice in negotiating the settlement agreement, the budget request definitely appears at odds with the intent with Colorado Ute Indian Water rights settlement agreement which was signed into law.

The Government of the United States participated in good faith negotiations to end a decade of Indian water rights litigation and the Committee feels strongly that the President's budget request should reflect the funding necessary to meet the Department of the Interior's commitments in the settlement.

Therefore, the Committee has included $5,900,000 in the bill in order to meet the construction schedules on the project.

Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000 to continue construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit of the Missouri River Basin plan in North Dakota.

The Committee notes that in January 1987, with the submission of the fiscal year 1988 budget, the Secretary of the Interior initiated a new policy of concentrating the limited resources of the Bureau of Reclamation on those projects nearest completion, thus accelerating their completion. At the same time, assurances were given by the administration that those projects in the second tier would move forward to the accelerated stage of funding as rapidly as those preceding them neared completion. The Committee, the State of North Dakota, and the local sponsors accepted those assurances and anticipated that funding for the Garrison project would, in line with Secretary Hodel's commitment, be requested at an accelerated level. Now, we are informed that notwithstanding the progress made on the first tier projects and the commitment previously referred to, out-year projections for funding of the Garrison project are zero or near zero. This does not appear to be consistent with the commitments made in 1987.

During this interim, the Bureau of Reclamation has completed construction of the Oakes test area of the Garrison project. Through the construction of drains and other features, the water table in this area has been drastically lowered, thereby destroying its efficacy for dry-land farming. Now, due to inadequate planning and failure to foresee or acknowledge the consequences of over 1 year of subnormal precipitation, there is the very real danger of inadequate supplies of water to operate the Oakes test area. Therefore, for the purpose of supplementing flows from the James River and Jamestown Reservoir during the interim pending the delivery of project water from the Missouri River, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to develop ground water resources in accordance with the laws of the State of North Dakota for utilization on the Oakes test area to assure test areas operations during periods when the James River or the Jamestown Reservoir water are inadequate.

Umatilla Basin Project, OR.—The Committee is concerned that the fish and wildlife provisions of the Umatilla Basin Project Act cannot be fully implemented without additional water monitoring facilities, and expects the Bureau to allocate adequate funds for these activities.

Central Utah Project.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to utilize $15,000,000 to compensate the Strawberry Water Users Association in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 100-563, and has stricken the House general provision which amends the authorizing legislation to eliminate this requirement.

A provision has been included in the bill which reinforces the intent as stated in Public Law 100-563.

Columbia Basin Project, Washington.—Out of the total amount appropriated for the Columbia Basin Project, $300,000 should be used to complete the ongoing environmental impact statement and determine the future development of the Columbia Basin Project. In addition, $225,000 of the amount recommended should be used to conduct the Franklin County roads study.

Savings and slippages.—The Committee has increased the amount included for savings and slippages for construction. Based on testimony from the Bureau of Reclamation, adequate funds will remain to maintain completion schedules presented in the budget to Congress last year for all projects. Therefore, the Committee expects the Bureau to apply this additional reduction to projects in the administration's fiscal year 1990 budget request where savings have occurred or to projects with improved construction schedules.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1989	$187,731,000
Budget estimate, 1990	232,287,000
House allowance	212,287,000
Committee recommendation	212,287,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $212,287,000, the same as the House allowance.

The appropriation recommended under this heading provides for the operation and maintenance of 37 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects in fiscal year 1989. Projects are operated for power production, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits.

Provision is also made for administration of water marketing contracts on Corps of Engineers projects, examination of existing structures, and administration of the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1261).

In addition, the Bureau's attention is directed to the need for funds to clean up the Lake Roosevelt shoreline.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1989	$26,022,000
Budget estimate, 1990	33,292,000
House allowance	34,122,000
Committee recommendation	34,122,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $34,122,000. This is the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

The Committee recommendation does not include funds for any new loan commitments because of budget constraints. The Committee has included follow-on funding for three loans started in previous years which were not included in the budget for 1989.

Middle Creek Dam Rehabilitation Project, Montana.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation considers the Middle Creek dam safety problem as a hazard reduction project and has approved the State of Montana's loan application. The Committee has included $830,000 plus any additional available funds to begin construction to correct the dam safety problems and rehabilitate the project.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated through fiscal year 1989	Fiscal year 1990 budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
LOAN PROGRAM					
CALIFORNIA					
Elsinore Valley Irrigation District	$25,975,000	$15,154,000	$10,821,000	$10,821,000	$10,821,000
San Bernardino County—Day Creek	13,412,000	4,252,000	9,160,000	9,160,000	9,160,000
United Water Conservation District	18,156,000	11,908,000	6,247,000	6,247,000	6,247,000
COLORADO					
Stagecoach project	7,037,000	4,600,000	2,437,000	2,437,000	2,437,000
MONTANA					
Middle Creek Dam rehabilitation project	3,799,000			830,000	830,000
TEXAS					
Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1 suppl.	12,972,000	2,000,000	3,742,000	3,742,000	3,742,000
VARIOUS					
Administration of the loan program	15,938,000	11,157,000	885,000	885,000	885,000
Total, loan program			33,292,000	34,122,000	34,122,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1989	($27,766,000)
Budget estimate, 1990	(31,092,000)
House allowance	(31,922,000)
Committee recommendation	(31,922,000)

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $31,922,000.

This limitation provides control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in fiscal year 1989.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$48,313,000
Budget estimate, 1990	47,983,000
House allowance	47,983,000
Committee recommendation	47,983,000

An appropriation of $47,983,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Commissioner's office, Denver office, and other offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1989	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000 which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failure, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 1989	$4,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	8,500,000
House allowance	8,500,000
Committee recommendation	8,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,500,000 for the working capital fund of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The fund provides for more efficient financing and financial management of centralized administrative services and acquisition of the Business Acquisition Project and other capital equipment for support of Bureau programs and for work performed for others.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities including biological and environmental research, and basic energy sciences and supporting research and technical analysis; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; civilian nuclear waste fund; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund.

DOE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITY

The Department of Energy maintains our Nation's great scientific capability through the national laboratories and other DOE-related institutions. These are an invaluable resource of mathematical, scientific, and engineering expertise that should be tapped to promote competitiveness through joint scientific and technological ventures with industry and academia and to improve the education of America's youth. The Committee once again urges the Department, and specifically the national laboratories, to actively seek areas of cooperation with the National Science Foundation, the Department of Education, and other departments agencies and universities to coordinate and maximize the use of the Nation's research dollars, facilities, and manpower in such joint ventures.

In addition, the Department and the laboratories should take such steps as are necessary to improve the transfer of technology and the results of research and development to the marketplace. The new DOE management is also urged to review the current framework, processes, and programs used for R&D laboratory technology transfer.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$1,828,394,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,859,987,000
House allowance	1,851,327,000
Committee recommendation	1,925,187,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1989	$313,932,000
Budget estimate, 1990	302,289,000
House allowance	284,189,000
Committee recommendation	290,279,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,215,466,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental and biological research are also included.

These programs address the development of both short and longer term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The President's budget proposes reductions of $21,018,000 from the current year's level of funding for solar and renewable energy activities. This budget request would continue the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 8 years—from about $550,000,000 in 1981 to the fiscal year 1990 proposal of $71,156,000.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar and renewable technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers the continuation of activities in solar energy research and development to be a vital component in a balanced energy program. With a sustained commitment of the scientific and engineering talents in Government and private sector organizations, research progress can establish the knowledge and materials base required for the effective application of a new generation of solar technologies.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends program funds and staffing levels to assure progress in this research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $94,606,000, which is $23,450,000 above the budget.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $5,205,000 for solar building energy systems, $160,000 below the level of operating expenses in the current year and $1,000,000 more than the House allowance.

The recommendation includes up to $600,000 to continue the ongoing Government-industry partnership effort to solve cooling and dehumidification problems in commercial and residential buildings in hot, humid climates. The Department should report on the agency's plans to redirect either the Solar Buildings Program and the Community Building Systems Program in order to continue these parallel programs through a merger or redirection of funds.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $35,500,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is the same as the 1989 level. This recommended funding level will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems. Research must be maintained in high technology industries such as the photovoltaic industry if we are to remain competitive in the international marketplace. In the last few years, the U.S. share of the international photovoltaics market fell from over 80 percent to nearly 50 percent. The Japanese market share almost doubled.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development.

The House allowance of $500,000 is included to continue the Southeast and Southwest Regional Experiment Station work with Sandia National Laboratories on new photovoltaic cell technologies.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $15,382,000 for solar thermal energy, an increase of $2,000,000 to the budget request and about the same as the current year amount. The goal of this program is to advance the engineering and scientific understanding of solar thermal technology and to establish the technology base from which private industry can develop solar thermal production options for introduction into the energy market. These funds are to be applied to collection technology, energy conversion technology, and systems and application technology.

The recommendation of an increase of $2,000,000 to the proposed budget is to continue development of second generation troughs and dish/engines and breakdown of toxic waste using solar concentration. The Committee also urges the Department to provide funding, not to exceed $300,000 each, and methods for joint DOE/industry cost-shared efforts to transfer DOE-developed technologies to the U.S. solar industry.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $15,580,000 for the biofuels program which is $6,500,000 over the budget request and $2,145,000 more than the current amount funding levels.

The goal of this program is to conduct research that will provide the technology to increase the supply of domestically available feedstocks and convert those feedstocks to liquid and gaseous fuels.

The Committee recommendation includes the House-passed allocation of $500,000 for the Hawaii biofuels program and $2,400,000 to continue the hydrogen production technology efforts in the amounts and at the same centers as approved for the current fiscal year.

Funding of $4,000,000 is allocated for the regional biofuels program which needs greater emphasis on transferring technologies to the private sector. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $9,350,000 for wind energy systems, $1,000,000 more than the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

These additional funds are to be used to initiate a program to design and build an advanced turbine (200 to 1,000 kilowatts) in cooperation with the private sector.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $4,178,000 for ocean energy systems, the same as the House allowance. The objective of the Ocean Energy Program is to develop a generic technical data base and reduce the technical risks associated with the extraction and use of ocean-derived energy sources to the point that allows industry to judge where and when the technology could be commercialized. The Committee recommendation provides that of the $4,178,000 for the ocean energy program, not less than $2,100,000 shall be made available to PICHTR, an organization established by the State of Hawaii pursuant to section 3 of act 152 of the 1983 Hawaii State legislative session, to continue work on the PICHTR-OTEC project.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $9,411,000 for other solar activities. This amount includes funds for program direction and support, technology transfer activities; and $1,054,000 for the International Solar Energy Program to maintain industry export promotion programs mandated by the Committee on Renewable Energy, Commerce, and Trade [CORECT]. The CORECT activities are to be shared to a greater extent with the Department of Commerce International Trade Administration than currently is the case. The Committee also approves $500,000 for the last contribution for PACSAT, and final development of this low-orbit satellite technical assistance project with an ongoing consortium as a Government/private cost share for deployment in 1990.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $18,509,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $3,100,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems, which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

The Committee recognizes the complex nature of the geothermal resource base and the need for developing improved analytical and testing capabilities. The Committee supports continuation of research activities to improve the tools and methods available for addressing the technical challenges associated with locating, evaluating, and extracting geothermal resources.

The recommendation includes $6,000,000 for geopressured resources, to continue the existing contract work in three field wells: Pleasant Bayou, Hulin, and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids.

The budget request of $3,500,000 for the hot dry rock program is approved and $1,000,000 is included to assist the State of Hawaii in geothermal resource verification.

The Committee supports continuation of the Geoheat Institute technology assistance contract within available funds.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $29,902,000 for electric energy systems and electric energy storage.

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

The electric energy systems program is mainly applied research. That is, research to advance the state of the art in electric system concepts and technologies. This means that virtually all projects have a known objective or application, with the research carried to proof of concept and risks understood. Electric energy storage systems include battery, thermal and mechanical, and chemical storage technologies.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $17,313,000 is provided for electric energy systems, the same as the budget request and $3,300,000 less than the House allowance. The recommended amount includes $12,122,000 for materials research and continuing research and development of electric system applications of high temperature superconducting technology.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $12,589,000 is included for energy storage, an increase of $4,000,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes $1,050,000 to continue work on the aluminum/metal-air battery system, and $2,000,000 for continuing a laboratory-industry initiative in electrochemical research and proton exchange membrane [PEM] fuel cell technology. The Committee agrees with the House allocation for the technology based electrochemical energy storage and battery research efforts carried out at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

The Department has identified the zinc-bromine utility load-leveling battery technology as a significant energy storage option for electric utilities to mitigate shortages in peak power generating capacity expected in the mid to late 1990's. The Committee directs

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1989	FY 1990 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
	UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
	PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
	COLORADO					
	ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	336,484,000	9,511,000	3,727,000	7,113,000	5,900,000
	DOLORES PROJECT	450,213,000	302,467,000	41,146,000	41,146,000	41,146,000
	UTAH					
	CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,656,350,000	930,264,000	116,170,000	116,170,000	116,170,000
	CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	198,452,000	5,823,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
	DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
	CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT, UTAH	70,132,000	60,442,000	122,000	122,000	122,000
	DALLAS CREEK PROJECT, COLORADO	129,475,000	117,604,000	265,000	265,000	265,000
	RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
	RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	169,957,000	114,765,000	9,143,000	9,143,000	9,143,000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	261,221,000	61,075,000	19,128,000	19,128,000	19,128,000
	TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			189,751,000	193,137,000	191,924,000
	COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
	CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
	ARIZONA					
	CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	3,353,420,000	2,101,220,000	188,823,000	188,823,000	188,823,000
	CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS	376,475,000	282,947,000	15,932,000	15,932,000	15,932,000
	CENTRAL ARIZONA-SAFETY OF DAMS	86,900,000	15,070,000	13,843,000	13,843,000	13,843,000
	TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT			218,598,000	218,598,000	218,598,000
	ASSOCIATED ITEMS					
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	---	-22,988,000	-49,933,000	-49,933,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			644,307,000	661,008,000	662,120,000

that $1,000,000 be obligated in fiscal year 1990 for the zinc-bromine utility load-leveling battery to support hardware scale-up and qualification activities required for utility market penetration.

NUCLEAR ENERGY R&D PROGRAM

A total of $340,275,000 is provided for the Nuclear Energy Research and Development Program, $38,910,000 less than the House allowance and $10,410,000 less than the budget request. The Committee has eliminated the House general reduction of $16,000,000. The sum of $238,600,000 is provided for remedial actions and waste technology.

Funds are included for civilian reactor research, space and defense power systems, remedial action programs, and civilian waste research and development.

Light water reactors [LWR].—An amount of $25,000,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is the same as the House allowance and $1,000,000 more than the budget request.

Advanced reactor research and development.—The Committee recommends $60,185,000 for advanced reactor R&D, $20,315,000 less than the fiscal year 1989 allowance. The Committee recommendation agrees with the House action in providing additional funds for the high temperature gas reactor [HTGR] and includes $25,000,000 to continue the current program. An increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request is provided for the Argonne National Laboratory [ANL] in Idaho for the integral fast reactor program. In addition, $3,000,000 is for the Advanced Control Test Operation [ACTO] Program and $1,000,000 is for the shielding work, both activities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Committee concurs with the continuation of funding for the University Research Program in Robotics for Advanced Reactors as proposed by the House.

Space and defense power systems.—The Committee recommends $32,090,000 for space and defense power systems, $12,910,000 less than the budget request. This includes funds for the SP–100 program operating and capital expenses, for isotope power systems and for the multimegawatt power systems, including continued development of thermionic technology. Budget allocation constraints will require other departments and agencies to come up with their fair share of the costs of these activities.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $44,200,000, which is $16,500,000 more than fiscal year 1989 and $16,000,000 less than the House allowance and the budget request. These funds are used to provide support for NASA and DOD missions. Budget allocation constraints will require other agencies to help offset the cost of these efforts.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation provides a total of $155,200,000 in operating expenses for the facilities account. This allowance is an increase of $50,800,000 over fiscal year 1989 and is a reduction to the budget request and the House bill. An amount of $90,000,000 is provided for the Fast Flux Test Facility [FFTF] in Richland, WA. This is an increase of almost $25,000,000 over the current level. The Committee understands that the Energy and Technology Engineering Center [ETEC] will be receiving additional funds from the Defense New Production Reactor Program in the upcoming year and, therefore, the additional funds proposed by the House are not included in this activity. The Department is to carefully examine the role and work for fiscal year 1990.

REMEDIAL ACTIONS AND WASTE TECHNOLOGY

The total of $238,600,000 for remedial actions and waste technology activities is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Uranium mill tailings.—The Committee recommends $96,000,000 for the uranium mill tailings remedial action program, which is the level of the budget request and $15,000,000 below the fiscal year 1989 level.

The Committee expects that the funds provided for uranium mill tailings remedial cleanup activities will be effectively applied to those remediation sites where work in ongoing and near completion, as well as those sites that are ready to proceed in fiscal year 1990, except for emergency situations, where health and safety requirements dictate otherwise. The Committee further notes that the cooperation of the Bureau of Land Management and the States in many of the remedial action activities is essential to the expeditious and cost-effective completion of this work. The sum of $30,000,000 is recommended for management of the surplus radioactivity contaminated facilities, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Byproducts program.—Over the past several years, the Department of Energy has been directed to support development of radioluminescent lighting for remote airfields. The Committee recommends that the same amount as the current year be provided out of available funds for the continued support of radioluminescent light development.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $114,626,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, an increase of $23,626,000 over the fiscal year 1989 appropriation.

The Environment, Safety and Health [ES&H] Program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H Program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety-related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

Carbon dioxide and the greenhouse effect linked to global change has become a national and international science and energy policy issue and is emerging as a major policy issue. The budget request contains funds in fiscal year 1990 for policy analysis, research, and joint model intercomparison, cloud and ocean research activities. Policy analysis activities are required to investigate the potential carbon dioxide reduction through energy strategic planning and to identify regions in jeopardy and potential effects on resources such as forests and agriculture. Work is proposed under this account as well as the Biological and Environmental Research Program in the Office of Energy Research.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee recommends $1,050,000 to continue baseline operations support and for facility maintenance, research and development, and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $316,865,000 for biological and environmental research, $50,000,000 over the budget request.

This program has two main objectives: (1) To develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

Global change.—The Department is directed to accelerate research in the area of early detection of the greenhouse effect in the atmosphere and in the determination of definitive quantitative links between the increase of greenhouse gases and the symptoms of global warming. It is necessary to eliminate or reduce scientific uncertainties over data and the causal link between CO_2 and temperate rise before policy or legislative actions are taken to reduce emissions. These efforts are to be conducted in fiscal year 1990 at a level of $52,300,000, an increase of $30,000,000 above the President's request.

Epidemiology.—A comprehensive epidemiologic data resource [CEDR] is to be developed with advice and guidance from a panel of experts under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences. The Committee recommends an initial amount of $5,000,000, from within available funds, is to be allocated for a survey of all DOE sites to determine the nature and amount of epidemiologic data to be collected and to allow initiation of efforts leading to development of a centralized repository for epidemiologic data to help alleviate public concerns by allowing non-DOE researchers access to epidemiologic data.

Human genome project.—The Committee strongly supports the Department of Energy's role in the human genome project and the full budget request of $27,600,000 is approved. However, the Committee is disappointed that the Department does not have a greater role as it is uniquely qualified to do more because of its national laboratories strength in technology development and management of multidisciplinary scientific projects. Because the Committee believes that the Department of Energy can make a greater contribution to the effort to map and eventually sequence the human genome, it urges the new DOE management to seek a more active and greater role for the Department in this effort.

Nuclear medicine program.—The Committee has approved the full budget request of $37,645,000 for the nuclear medicine program. The program has yielded a significant return on investment in terms of vastly improved diagnostic and therapeutic technologies that are rapidly transferred to the clinical setting. These advances not only improve the quality of medical care for thousands of people across the country, but they also reduce total U.S. health care expenditures by reducing hospitalization time, improving the diagnostic process, and often obviating the need for more costly, more invasive therapies such as cardiac catheterization and bypass surgery. The program has produced remarkable technological breakthroughs with a relatively small budget.

It is the Committee's intent that the Department use a substantial portion of the incremental funding provided for the Nuclear Medicine Applications Program to support collaborative university-based centers working in high-field NMR spectroscopy and position emission tomography [PET]. The Committee further intends that the Department shall give priority in this regard to university centers already working in these fields with DOE support or through active involvement with DOE national laboratories.

Boron neutron capture therapy.—The Committee has approved the budget request contained in this account for the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy Program at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. These funds together with available funds for the Power Burst Facility [PBF] will provide a total of $7,500,000. This program also has the support of the National Cancer Institute. Research results to date in the program have been positive and provide encouragement that a viable glioblastoma and melanoma cancer therapy will be developed.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for project 88–R–124, for a neurosensory facility in basic and applied research at the Oregon Health Sciences University. These funds will be used for design and construction, and may also be used for equipment acquisition to the extent that federally funded equipment is offset by non-Federal matching funds. It is the Committee's understanding that non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project and no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

The recommendation also includes $10,000,000 for project 89–R–121, the Biomedical Research Institute, LSU Medical Center in Shreveport, LA. The Biomedical Research Institute will be supported and operated as a partnership by the Biomedical Research Foundation, the Louisiana State University system, and the State of Louisiana. The institute will house and conduct major specialized research and programs for cardiovascular disease, molecular biology and neurobiology. These funds will be used for design and construction and may also be used for equipment acquisition to provide research facilities containing state-of-the-art core research labs for monoclonal antibody production, oligonucleotide and peptide synthesis gene cloning, DNA sequencing, high performance liquid chromotography, tissue culture, and positron emission tomography. Research projects will be jointly sponsored by the foundation, the medical center, and industry. This will be a cost-shared facility among the foundation, the State, and the Federal Government. It is the Committee's understanding that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The Department is evaluating a new policy that encompasses all fusion research—both magnetic and inertial confinement approaches. According to testimony, this new policy would focus research on resolution of the key unknowns that now limit progress, and support competitive research and development to achieve specific objectives over the mid and long terms. The Committee is advised that an independent, high level policy review of this approach is currently being organized and should report within the next few months.

The intent of the draft policy is to reach significant milestones in the development of fusion energy by the end of this decade through achievement of ignited fusion plasma in two new, large devices. These devices are the compact ignition tokamak [CIT] in magnetic confinement fusion, and the Laboratory Microfusion Facility [LMF] in inertial confinement fusion. Experiments attaining ignition in the CIT and high target gain in the LMF will permit a competitive evaluation of the potential for production of commercial power of the two different approaches (magnetic and inertial) to fusion.

Current experiments in magnetic fusion, conducted on the TFTR tokamak device at Princeton, are close to achieving conditions adequate for energy breakeven. The CIT device is intended to build on this success by igniting a fusion plasma in a tokamak, allowing the last remaining uncertainties in magnetic fusion physics to be fully explored. Although the CIT has been previously proposed to the Congress, the Department has asked that construction be deferred without prejudice until critical design issues are explored, which is expected to take 2 to 4 years. In particular, the Department has launched a transport initiative which, by identifying the detailed mechanisms of energy confinement in tokamaks, will permit redesign of the CIT to give high confidence that ignition will be achieved. This process of focusing on critical issues, and continuing that focus through CIT construction and operation, will necessarily require a narrowing of the overall programs breadth by eliminating less promising alternatives to tokamaks, but it must be done in a manner consistent with maintenance of a strong technical base in magnetic fusion, particularly in university programs. Competitive evaluation of CIT design, construction, and siting proposals will provide both the best creative thought and serious industrial involvement in magnetic fusion.

In inertial confinement fusion, several key issues also remain to be resolved before proceeding with construction of the high-gain device, the LMF. Impressive demonstrations of target performance have now shown that high-gain targets of appropriate sizes will work. Some detailed physics issues concerning instabilities in target compression and laser light projection must be investigated in existing facilities to insure that an LMF with a driver of about 10 megajoules energy will reach high-gain with high confidence. Also, a technology development comparison must be conducted to determine the best drive to meet the target requirements at reasonable cost and with high confidence.

The Committee is advised that construction of these two devices without major increases in the Department's overall expenditures for fusion development would be a reasonable achievement and would significantly advance the prospects for realizing commercial fusion power, with the manifold benefits that would confer. The Committee understands the policy review now getting underway will evaluate the readiness of both the magnetic and inertial confinement components to take these ambitious steps, the practical adequacy of budget and technology to sustain them, and the appropriateness of the various areas of competition that are proposed.

With this background and with all the perturbations that have occurred in the program leading up to announcement of the Department's new draft policy, the Committee is now faced with a program in disarray and a situation worsened by severe budgetary constraints and insufficient allocations. The Committee is disappointed that it has taken so long to put a stable and logical fusion program in place. Further, the Committee now anticipates that it will take several months of further review and then congressional review and testimony before a new course, or reaffirmation of the old course, is established.

The Committee has provided $330,450,000 for the fusion program, an increase of $24,700,000 above the House allowance and $18,800,000 less than the budget request. And because of the circumstances, the Committee is recommending that these funds be provided without further allocation between program components, projects, and activities within the fusion program. These funds are made available to the Secretary to carry out the fusion program at the Secretary's discretion. The Secretary may reserve a modest portion of such funds which shall be available to carry out any new policy directions only after prior approval of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development appropriations of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate after review by the Committee of the result of the fusion program policy review.

The Committee also agrees with the Department's request to defer without prejudice the construction of the CIT. Accordingly, the Department is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations a full accounting of the policy review, a statement outlining any redirections within the fusion program, and the budgetary impacts of such redirections.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $671,421,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences, multiprogram facility support, oversight, analysis, and university support. The Committee provides $683,271,000 for these activities, an increase of $11,850,000 over the budget request and $7,450,000 less than the House.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $594,000,000 is recommended for basic energy sciences, an increase of $4,000,000 above the budget request and $3,700,000 less than the House allowance, as shown in the following programs and activities.

Materials science.—The Committee recommends an additional $4,000,000 which, together with the $5,500,000 proposed in the budget, will provide for a total of $9,500,000 in fiscal year 1990 to continue research and development and preliminary engineering work leading to an Advanced Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. No construction funding is proposed or approved.

Energy biosciences.—The Committee has approved $700,000 from within available funds to complete membrane-based energy research at the Oregon Graduate Center.

Advanced energy projects.—It is expected that the next generation of computer chips will have submicron features. Recently, a submicron chip fabrication technique, known as x-ray lithography, was demonstrated by IBM at the National Synchrotron Light Source at Brookhaven National Laboratory. An intensive worldwide technology race is underway. To win, powerful manufacturing quality x-ray sources based on synchrotron radiation are needed. Several past congressional actions encouraged the development of U.S. technology for advanced chip fabrication. This initiative will transfer the technology of synchrotron x-ray sources from DOE laboratories to U.S. industry in about 2 years.

Synchrotron rings are widely believed to be the only sources of x-ray compatible with mass production of next generation chips. DOE laboratories lead the world in the technology of research-quality synchrotron rings. However, the United States is lagging behind Japan in the development of production-quality synchrotron x-ray sources. This initiative will support the design and construction of two production-quality synchrotron x-ray sources, at a total cost of approximately $33,000,000. First year costs of $15,000,000 will provide for competitive designs and initial construction of two competitive synchrotron rings. DOE is directed to report to the Committee on the details of the designs, when they are selected, and to inform the Committee of the participants in the design and construction of the synchrotron rings. It is desirable that the rings be utilized by U.S. chip manufacturers on a cost-reimbursable basis. Up to $15,000,000 from within funds in the basic energy sciences program is recommended for this initiative.

Cooperative and other programs.—Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Education Foundation, and Jackson State University have had a cooperative arrangement designed to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. This consortium has had a major impact on the development of minority science faculties, who are making significant contributions in teaching and research. The Committee directs the Department to provide $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 to maintain and support this effort.

From within funds made available in applied mathematical science, basic energy sciences, and other energy programs in this account not otherwise discussed in this report, an amount equal to the current fiscal year 1989 amount is to be made available to continue the cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and the Supercomputer Computations Research Institute [SCRI] located at Florida State University.

University research support.—The Committee recommendation provides $6,000,000 to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These moneys are to be made available for graduate fellowships, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering. The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for upgrading and operating of university nuclear research and training reactors.

The Committee has approved the full amount requested for university research reactors fuel assistance, which includes funds for refueling for five reactors, three with low enriched uranium fuel [LEU], and continues support for LEU conversion as mandated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

An additional $850,000 is provided to assist the Arkansas Technical University in providing housing and associated facilities for a research reactor that it is in the process of acquiring. It is the Committee's understanding that non-Federal funds from the State and private industry for this cost-shared project have already been made available to the university.

Multiprogram facilities.—The recommendation includes $52,997,000 for multiprogram lab facilities support, the same as the budget request. These funds are also to be made available to support major single purpose energy laboratories facilities in fiscal year 1990, and the Department is urged to include support for these facilities in its future budgets.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	5,365,000	4,055,000	4,055,000	5,055,000
Capital equipment	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	5,365,000	4,205,000	4,205,000	5,205,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	34,700,000	24,650,000	35,600,000	34,600,000
Capital equipment	800,000	400,000	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	35,500,000	25,050,000	36,500,000	35,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	14,700,000	13,232,000	13,232,000	15,232,000
Capital equipment	300,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	15,000,000	13,382,000	13,382,000	15,382,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	12,880,000	8,480,000	16,780,000	14,780,000
Capital equipment	555,000	600,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	13,435,000	9,080,000	17,580,000	15,580,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	8,339,000	8,150,000	9,150,000	9,150,000
Capital equipment	500,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	8,839,000	8,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	4,105,000	2,078,000	4,078,000	4,078,000
Capital equipment	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Ocean energy systems	4,105,000	2,178,000	4,178,000	4,178,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	82,244,000	62,245,000	85,195,000	85,195,000
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE	1,000,000	554,000	1,054,000	1,054,000
B. Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses	2,400,000	1,823,000	2,213,000	1,823,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment	392,000	482,000	482,000	482,000
Construction:				
General plant projects	250,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute	642,000	657,000	657,000	657,000
D. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses	709,000	772,000	772,000	772,000
Capital equipment	45,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Resource assessment	754,000	772,000	772,000	772,000
E. Program support - OE	970,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
F. Program direction - OE	4,164,000	4,205,000	4,205,000	4,205,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Other solar energy........................	9,930,000	8,911,000	9,801,000	9,411,000
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY..............................	92,174,000	71,156,000	94,996,000	94,606,000
(Operating expenses)..............................	(89,332,000)	(68,899,000)	(92,039,000)	(91,649,000)
(Capital equipment).............................	(2,592,000)	(2,082,000)	(2,782,000)	(2,782,000)
(Construction)................................	(250,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Geopressured research				
Operating expenses............................	6,000,000	2,900,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
II. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses............................	11,935,000	11,233,000	11,233,000	11,233,000
Capital equipment.............................	795,000	450,000	450,000	450,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	12,730,000	11,683,000	11,683,000	11,683,000
III. Program direction - OE	826,000	826,000	826,000	826,000
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	19,556,000	15,409,000	18,509,000	18,509,000
(Operating expenses)	(18,761,000)	(14,959,000)	(18,059,000)	(18,059,000)
(Capital equipment)	(795,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses	3,000,000	2,200,000	4,000,000	2,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses	2,494,000	2,494,000	2,494,000	2,494,000
C. System and materials research				
Operating expenses	17,722,000	12,122,000	13,622,000	12,122,000
D. Program direction - OE	350,000	497,000	497,000	497,000
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	23,566,000	17,313,000	20,613,000	17,313,000
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	9,671,000	6,407,000	10,407,000	10,407,000
Capital equipment	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
Subtotal, Battery storage	9,698,000	6,434,000	10,434,000	10,434,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Thermal and chemical storage				
Operating expenses	3,400,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
C. Program direction - OE	395,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	13,493,000	8,589,000	12,589,000	12,589,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	37,059,000	25,902,000	33,202,000	29,902,000
(Operating expenses)	(37,032,000)	(25,875,000)	(33,175,000)	(29,875,000)
(Capital equipment)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NUCLEAR				
I. Nuclear Energy R&D				
A. Light water reactor				
Operating expense	26,800,000	24,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D				
Operating expense	79,500,000	30,685,000	53,185,000	58,185,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	80,500,000	32,685,000	55,185,000	60,185,000
C. Space & defense power systems				
Operating expense	64,490,000	26,930,000	26,930,000	21,930,000
Capital equipment	7,850,000	6,370,000	6,370,000	2,460,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
89-N-111 Dips	2,500,000	---	---	---
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	21,160,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	7,700,000
Subtotal, construction	23,660,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	7,700,000
General reduction	-5,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	91,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	32,090,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems				
Operating expense	24,700,000	40,200,000	40,200,000	30,200,000
Capital equipment	3,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Construction:				
89-N-111 RPSF	---	16,000,000	16,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	27,700,000	60,200,000	60,200,000	44,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Facilities				
Operating expense	104,400,000	165,200,000	170,200,000	155,200,000
Capital equipment	4,600,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Construction:				
90-N-201 GPP	---	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
90-N-202 Mod to Reactors	---	5,250,000	5,250,000	5,250,000
89-N-112 Mods to reactors	3,400,000	---	---	---
89-N-113 GPP	3,800,000	---	---	---
89-N-115 Fire suf. imp., ANL	2,000,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
Subtotal, construction	9,200,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,700,000
Subtotal, Facilities	118,200,000	180,000,000	185,000,000	170,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Program direction - OE	8,470,000	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy R & D	352,670,000	350,685,000	379,185,000	340,275,000
(Operating expense)	(303,360,000)	(295,815,000)	(324,315,000)	(299,315,000)
(Capital equipment)	(16,450,000)	(16,470,000)	(16,470,000)	(12,560,000)
(Construction)	(32,860,000)	(38,400,000)	(38,400,000)	(28,400,000)
II. Remedial actions & waste technology				
A. Formerly utilized sites				
Operating expenses	22,400,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000
Capital equipment	200,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, formerly utilized sites	22,600,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Uranium program mill tailings				
Operating expenses	108,400,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000
Capital equipment	2,600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, uranium program mill tailings	111,000,000	96,000,000	96,000,000	96,000,000
C. Surplus facilities				
Operating expenses	46,900,000	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
Capital equipment	300,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, surplus facilities	47,200,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
D. West valley				
Operating expenses	67,100,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Low level waste				
Operating expenses	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
G. Program direction - OE	2,400,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Subtotal, Remedial actions & waste technology	255,300,000	238,600,000	238,600,000	238,600,000
III. Civilian waste R&D				
A. Spent fuel storage R&D				
Operating expenses	2,300,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
B. Program direction	198,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D	2,498,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
General reduction....................................	---	---	-16,000,000	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR......................................	610,468,000	590,285,000	602,785,000	579,875,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(558,058,000)	(533,815,000)	(546,315,000)	(537,315,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(19,550,000)	(18,070,000)	(18,070,000)	(14,160,000)
(Construction).....................................	(32,860,000)	(38,400,000)	(38,400,000)	(28,400,000)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses..................................	87,900,000	121,526,000	121,526,000	111,526,000
Capital equipment...................................	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH.................	91,000,000	124,626,000	124,626,000	114,626,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses	1,500,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
ENVIRONMENT R & D				
I. Biological and Environmental Research				
Operating expenses	222,500,000	250,865,000	256,865,000	280,865,000
Capital equipment	9,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Construction:				
90-R-120 GPP	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
89-R-120 GPP	3,500,000	---	---	---
90-R-121 Biomedical Research Institute, LSU Medical Center, LA	---	---	---	10,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-123 Cancer Res. Ctr., Univ. of SC...........	8,000,000	---	---	---
88-R-124 Oregon Health Science Univ., OR.........	12,000,000	---	---	10,000,000
Subtotal, Construction............................	23,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	23,500,000
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research............	255,000,000	266,865,000	272,865,000	316,865,000
II. Program direction - OE............................				
A. Bio and env. research - PD......................	4,000,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT R & D............................	259,000,000	271,465,000	277,465,000	321,465,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(226,500,000)	(255,465,000)	(261,465,000)	(285,465,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(9,000,000)	(12,500,000)	(12,500,000)	(12,500,000)
(Construction)................................	(23,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(23,500,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems..............................	175,565,000	168,150,000	168,150,000	
B. Development and technology......................	54,145,000	56,700,000	56,700,000	
C. Applied plasma physics..........................	78,155,000	73,215,000	73,215,000	
D. Planning and projects...........................	5,000,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	
E. Program direction - OE.........................	4,600,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
F. Capital equipment...............................	21,635,000	13,185,000	13,185,000	
G. Construction:				
90-E-900 GPP..................................	---	9,300,000	9,300,000	
89-R-800 Confinement physics res facility.....	---	13,300,000	---	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-R-900 GPP	8,900,000	---	---	
88-R-92 Compact ignition tokamak, PPPL, Princeton, NJ	3,500,000	5,500,000	---	
Subtotal, Construction	12,400,000	28,100,000	9,300,000	
General reduction	---	---	-24,700,000	
TOTAL, FUSION	351,500,000	349,250,000	305,750,000	330,450,000
(Operating expenses)	(317,465,000)	(307,965,000)	(283,265,000)	(307,965,000)
(Capital equipment)	(21,635,000)	(13,185,000)	(13,185,000)	(13,185,000)
(Construction)	(12,400,000)	(28,100,000)	(9,300,000)	(9,300,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Materials sciences	180,746,000	202,252,000	209,952,000	206,252,000
B. Chemical sciences	134,993,000	147,917,000	147,917,000	147,917,000
C. Applied mathematical sciences	42,970,000	44,877,000	44,877,000	44,877,000
D. Engineering and geosciences	33,413,000	34,093,000	34,093,000	34,093,000
E. Advanced energy projects	14,643,000	14,936,000	14,936,000	14,936,000
F. Energy biosciences	20,780,000	21,200,000	21,200,000	21,200,000
G. Program direction - OE	4,900,000	5,450,000	5,450,000	5,450,000
H. Capital equipment	31,700,000	37,587,000	37,587,000	37,587,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
I. Construction:				
90-R-400 GPP................................	---	5,588,000	5,588,000	5,588,000
90-R-401 AIP................................	---	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
90-R-402 Partial Decon. & Protective Storage of the ANL CP-5 Research Reactor......	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
89-R-400 GPP................................	4,900,000	---	---	---
89-R-401 AIP................................	2,300,000	---	---	---
89-R-402 6-7 GeV Syn. Radiation Source........	6,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
88-R-403 3 GeV Spear Injector, SSRL...........	6,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
88-R-404 Ctr. for Advanced Microstructure & Devices, Louisiana State University.........	13,000,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-406 Ctr. for Automated Technology DREXEL	5,500,000	---	---	---
88-R-409 Proton Beam Cancer Treatment, Loma Linda Med'l Ctr., CA	11,100,000	---	---	---
87-R-403 Neutron Scattering experimental halls, Los Alamos, New Mexico	4,000,000	---	---	---
87-R-406 1-2 GeV Synch Rad Sc, LBL	25,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
87-R-411 Barry Goldwater Ctr. for Science & Engineering, Arizona State	10,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	88,300,000	81,688,000	81,688,000	81,688,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	552,445,000	590,000,000	597,700,000	594,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).................................	(432,445,000)	(470,725,000)	(478,425,000)	(474,725,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(31,700,000)	(37,587,000)	(37,587,000)	(37,587,000)
(Construction).................................	(88,300,000)	(81,688,000)	(81,688,000)	(81,688,000)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE..................	3,800,000	3,980,000	3,980,000	3,980,000
B. University research support - OE				
Operating expenses:				
1. University reactor fuel assistance........	2,100,000	2,265,000	2,265,000	3,115,000
2. Laboratory Coop Science Education Ctrs....	15,500,000	9,370,000	20,370,000	16,370,000
3. Energy manpower development program.......	2,770,000	2,761,000	2,761,000	2,761,000
4. R&D Laboratory Tech Transfer..............	1,400,000	1,675,000	2,275,000	1,675,000
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
Subtotal, University research support.............	21,770,000	16,071,000	27,671,000	23,921,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE....................	3,339,000	3,373,000	3,373,000	3,373,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. University research instrumentation............	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup.....	33,909,000	28,424,000	40,024,000	36,274,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(33,909,000)	(28,424,000)	(40,024,000)	(36,274,000)
III. Multiprogram Energy Laboratories - Fac. Sup.				
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities				
Construction:				
90-R-100 Trans. Fac. Replacement, ANL.......	---	350,000	350,000	350,000
90-R-121 Rehab Fire, Water, Pumping & Storage Systems, ANL.........................	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
90-R-107 Boiler Replacement, BNL............	---	324,000	324,000	324,000
90-R-108 Ctrl. Shops Alteration & Add., BNL.	---	310,000	310,000	310,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-R-109 Building Addition, BNL.............	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
90-R-110 Instrumentation Sup. Lab. Rehab, LB	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
90-R-111 Original Labsite Substation, LBL...	---	250,000	250,000	250,000
90-R-112 Measurements and Controls Support Facility, ORNL......................	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
90-R-113 Elec. Syst. Upgrade, ORNL..........	---	855,000	855,000	855,000
90-R-115 Laboratory & Sanitary Sewer Collection System Rehab., ANL...............	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
90-R-116 Hazardous Waste Management Projects, BNL............................	---	160,000	160,000	160,000
90-R-117 Slope/Seismic Stabilization LBL.....................................	---	500,000	500,000	500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-R-118 Fire Protection Upgrade, ORNL....................................	---	1,340,000	1,340,000	1,340,000
90-R-119 Sanitary Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements, ANL.....................	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
89-R-100 Trans fac replacement (ANL)........	350,000	---	---	---
89-R-101 Rehab fire, water, pumping and storage systems (ANL)......................	150,000	---	---	---
89-R-102 Fire Protection III, BNL...........	645,000	2,355,000	2,355,000	2,355,000
89-R-103 Boiler replacement (BNL)...........	409,000	---	---	---
89-R-104 Cosmotron bldg rehab (BNL).........	300,000	---	---	---
89-R-105 Building addition (BNL)............	1,625,000	---	---	---
89-R-106 Instrument support lab (LBL).......	200,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-R-107 Labsite Substation Rehab (LBL).....	250,000	---	---	---
89-R-108 Roads & Parking Rehab., ORNL.......	2,520,000	870,000	870,000	870,000
89-R-109 Measurements and controls support facility (ORNL).....................	1,100,000	---	---	---
89-R-110 Elec sys upgrade (ORNL)............	854,000	---	---	---
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL............	668,000	2,168,000	2,168,000	2,168,000
89-R-112 Replace PCB Transformers, ANL......	1,000,000	1,380,000	1,380,000	1,380,000
89-R-113 Environmental Upgrades, BNL........	1,500,000	3,262,000	3,262,000	3,262,000
88-R-802 Multiprogram lab bldg rehab., BNL..	1,445,000	---	---	---
88-R-804 Bldg. piping system upgrade, ORNL..	1,330,000	---	---	---
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL....	1,946,000	1,489,000	1,489,000	1,489,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL	3,448,000	4,837,000	4,837,000	4,837,000
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL	2,150,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
88-R-809 Plant mods to comply with EPA requirements, ANL	1,000,000	---	---	---
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling fac, LBL	3,950,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
88-R-814 Sewage treatment sys. upgrade, PNL	2,060,000	---	---	---
88-R-817 Upgrade fire protection, ORNL	980,000	---	---	---
87-R-752 Piping System Restoration, ORNL	600,000	---	---	---
87-R-753 Rehabilitate Laboratory Space (Building 200), ANL	3,600,000	2,611,000	2,611,000	2,611,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-755 Mechanical Systems Rehab., ANL.....	500,000	---	---	---
87-R-756 Waterline Replacement, ANL.........	3,134,000	537,000	537,000	537,000
87-R-757 Electrical System Rehab., LBL......	460,000	---	---	---
87-R-758 Rehab. Mechanical Utilities, LBL...	1,585,000	---	---	---
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements, BNL..	464,000	---	---	---
85-R-706 Medical facility, LLNL.............	312,000	---	---	---
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm sys. upgrad	375,000	---	---	---
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)...	490,000	399,000	399,000	399,000
Subtotal, Construction......................	41,400,000	32,497,000	32,497,000	32,497,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
General reduction	-10,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram facilities	31,400,000	32,497,000	32,497,000	32,497,000
(Construction)	(31,400,000)	(32,497,000)	(32,497,000)	(32,497,000)
B. Environmental compliance				
Operating expenses	8,770,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Capital Equipment	305,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
90-R-770 GPP	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
89-R-770 General Plant Projects	2,500,000	---	---	---
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL	11,787,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treat	1,113,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	15,400,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
Subtotal, Environmental Compliance Program	24,475,000	20,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy laboratories............	55,875,000	52,997,000	52,997,000	52,997,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(8,770,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(305,000)	---	---	---
(Construction)......................................	(46,800,000)	(43,997,000)	(43,997,000)	(43,997,000)
TOTAL, SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS.....	642,229,000	671,421,000	690,721,000	683,271,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(475,124,000)	(508,149,000)	(527,449,000)	(519,999,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(32,005,000)	(37,587,000)	(37,587,000)	(37,587,000)
(Construction).....................................	(135,100,000)	(125,685,000)	(125,685,000)	(125,685,000)

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

GROSS APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1989	$1,176,600,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,445,000,000
House allowance	1,445,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,428,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1989	$1,276,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,445,000,000
House allowance	1,500,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,500,900,000

The appropriation recommended for uranium supply and enrichment activities provides for uranium enrichment production, atomic vapor laser isotope separation [AVLIS] research and development, and related support activities. In this account, revenues received through the sale of enrichment services are used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing these services. The total budget request for fiscal year 1990 is $1,445,000,000. Revenues are estimated in the budget request of $1,500,900,000 which are to be used to offset the requested fiscal year 1990 appropriation.

Gaseous diffusion operations and support.—The budget request for this activity is $1,241,400,000 of which $1,184,300,000 is for operating expenses and $47,100,000 is for construction activities. The budget proposes the production of approximately 12 million separative work units [SWU] in fiscal year 1990.

The Federal Republic of Germany is seeking to sell a substantial inventory of enriched uranium previously purchased from DOE under offset agreements in 1969 and 1974 and subsequent contracts concluded between 1970 and 1981. The Department of Energy's uranium enrichment program has the opportunity to purchase this material at prices that could be less than the cost of production at the GDP's. The Committee intends that the Department purchase this material only in amounts that the Department determines results in power cost savings but in no event shall such purchases increase costs. The Committee expects the Department to manage any new acquisition in a manner which would minimize adverse effects on the balance of the fuel cycle.

The Committee directs the Department, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC], to conduct a study regarding the costs of licensing the gaseous diffusion plants located in Portsmouth, OH, and Paducah, KY, under the provisions of proposed Senate 83, as reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on June 7, 1989. Specifically, the Committee expects the study to estimate the cost of licensing the two plants under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 in the event that section 1601 of the Atomic Energy Act, as added by Senate 83, together with section 114 of Senate 83 is enacted. Such study shall be conducted from within available funds, be completed within 60 days of the enactment of this legislation, and shall be accompanied by the comments of the NRC.

Atomic vapor laser isotope separation.—The budget request for this activity is $148,000,000, of which $136,900,000 is for operating expenses and $11,100,000 is for capital equipment and construction. The Committee believes that the proposed program will not lead to AVLIS deployment in time to respond to competitive market pressures, thus dissipating the U.S. lead and investment in AVLIS. The Committee is convinced that DOE must decide whether to proceed with the development and deployment of the AVLIS technology as quickly as practicable. The Committee is alarmed with the time the program has taken to complete the full-scale demonstration of the AVLIS and the slow pace of transferring the technology from the laboratory to an industrial organization that would build and operate a production facility. While the revised schedule for accelerating completion of the technology that the Department has proposed is a step in the right direction, it is mandatory that DOE introduce an industrial perspective into the program now to avoid unnecessary deployment activities that the Department pursued with the gas centrifuge enrichment program in the mid-1980's. We simply must avoid another GCEP. Thus, the Committee directs the Department to proceed promptly with the establishment of an industrial entity that would take the technology from the laboratory to production.

Further, top management reviews addressing these matters should be completed before the next budget is presented to Congress. The Committee expects a full justification to be presented along with the budget presentation including plans for industrial participation.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - ER	667,000	674,000	674,000	674,000
B. Policy and management - NE	2,165,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
C. Policy and management - CE	1,763,000	1,563,000	1,563,000	1,563,000
TOTAL, POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	4,595,000	4,437,000	4,437,000	4,437,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
I. Technical information management program				
Operating expenses	13,100,000	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000
Capital equipment	900,000	950,000	950,000	950,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction	2,500,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Technical information mgmt program	16,500,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses	2,000,000	2,020,000	2,020,000	2,020,000
Construction:				
90-A-601 Modifications for energy mgmt	17,520,000	15,810,000	15,810,000	15,810,000
90-A-602 Convert Boiler No. 4 (ANL)	---	2,270,000	2,270,000	2,270,000
Subtotal, Construction	17,520,000	18,080,000	18,080,000	18,080,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	19,520,000	20,100,000	20,100,000	20,100,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Strategic facilities utilization program				
Operating expenses	1,977,000	1,977,000	1,977,000	1,977,000
Construction:				
90-A-101	---	198,000	198,000	198,000
General Plant Projects	198,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	198,000	198,000	198,000	198,000
Subtotal, Strategic facilities utilization prog	2,175,000	2,175,000	2,175,000	2,175,000
TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS	38,195,000	37,275,000	37,275,000	37,275,000
Subtotal, Energy supply research and development	2,147,276,000	2,162,276,000	2,190,816,000	2,215,466,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
General reduction....................................	---	---	-50,000,000	---
Use of Unoblig Balances - ESRD........................	-4,950,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.........	2,142,326,000	2,162,276,000	2,140,816,000	2,215,466,000
(Operating expenses).................................	(1,828,394,000)	(1,859,987,000)	(1,856,627,000)	(1,925,187,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(89,604,000)	(87,951,000)	(88,651,000)	(84,741,000)
(Construction)......................................	(224,328,000)	(214,338,000)	(195,538,000)	(205,538,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion operations and support				
Operating expenses..............................	984,000,000	1,184,300,000	1,184,300,000	1,184,300,000
Capital equipment..............................	12,800,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Construction:				
90-N-501 Cooling tower mods....................	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
90-N-502 General plant projects...............	---	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders........................	5,800,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
89-N-502 General plant projects...............	15,000,000	---	---	---
88-N-502 Process inventory control system, Pa	28,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$717,578,000
Budget estimate, 1990	770,981,000
House allowance	730,240,000
Committee recommendation	733,740,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1989	$204,538,000
Budget estimate, 1990	398,450,000
House allowance	332,191,000
Committee recommendation	364,691,000

The general science programs are concerned with basic research to discover and understand the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the basic forces in nature. Understanding of the laws of nature and the basic components from which matter and energy, in all their varied forms are composed, forms the foundation upon which all of modern science and technology rests. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes, sometimes in spectacular ways, to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base.

The general science program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near-term or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

The Committee recommends $1,098,431,000 for general science and research activities, which is $36,000,000 more than the House allowance, and $176,315,000 over the current level of funding.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $601,230,000 for high energy physics, a decrease of $15,000,000 from the budget level for fiscal year 1990 and $10,000,000 less than the House allowance.

The Committee has had to make difficult choices. To provide for other high priority and important work the Committee has identified a $10,000,000 reduction to the high energy physics alternating gradient synchrotron [AGS] which would receive approximately $100,000,000 in this fiscal year 1990 budget. It is intended that the remaining AGS funds be utilized to assure that the AGS is available for possible future use as an injector for a future relativistic heavy ion collider which is planned to be sited at Brookhaven.

For the past several years budget constraints have prohibited construction funding for the relativistic heavy ion collider [RHIC] at Brookhaven National Laboratory. The Committee recognizes that RHIC has been the highest priority for new facilities over the past several years at the DOE/NSF Nuclear Science Advisory Committee. The Committee urges the administration to review carefully and consider including the RHIC project in its fiscal year 1991 budget proposal.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $300,300,000 for nuclear physics activities, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee believes the construction of a detector for nuetrino interactions at the Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility can make a significant contribution toward testing the standard model, which is the present day's most unified description of the working of the fundamental forces of nature. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $1,400,000 in funding within the Nuclear Physics Medium Energy Physics Program.

For the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, the Committee recommends $65,000,000 for fiscal year 1990. Continuing to stretch out construction of this project is not in the interest of the taxpayers nor the nuclear physics program.

Superconducting Super Collider.—The Committee recommends $225,000,000 for the Superconducting Super Collider, of which, $135,000,000 is to initiate construction and $90,000,000 is for research and development.

The Committee recommends an additional $25,000,000 above the amount passed by the House. These additional funds are to be available only to initiate the first tunnel sector contract and for no other purpose.

The Committee recognizes the importance of the Super Collider to science and our Nation. It holds great potential for exploring the structure of matter and stimulating new technology.

In order to complete the SSC, non-Federal participation will be necessary. The State of Texas has offered financial contributions of approximately $1,000,000,000 toward the development, construction, and operation of the project. Based on the initial appropriation for construction, plus expected contributions from the State of Texas, it is hoped that amounts to be contributed by foreign countries can be further determined. It is the consensus of the Committee that the SSC should proceed whether foreign participation is forthcoming or not. Further, the Committee is concerned that in return for financial contributions, significant benefits in science and technology and industrial benefits would accrue to foreign nations and to the detriment of the United States.

The Committee understands the desire to reduce the cost of SSC to the U.S. Government by soliciting foreign contributions to the project. However, the Committee is concerned about the complications to management of the construction project that will be introduced by participation of foreign countries and the transfer of U.S. developed high technology to foreign companies.

The Committee has included a provision in the bill which provides that none of the funds provided in this act for the Superconducting Super Collider shall be available to finalize or implement any agreements for either in-kind or direct contributions from foreign countries until a full report on such international contributions has been provided to the Congress, unless the President or Secretary of Energy certify in writing that it is in the national interest of the United States to implement such an agreement. Funds available for the Superconducting Super Collider may be utilized to prepare agreements to allow the above report to Congress to be formulated.

It is the Committee's intent that the Secretary of Energy comply with all existing laws to ensure that the Federal funding for the development, construction, and operation of the SSC be made available to the extent practicable to business concerns or other organizations owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a)(5) and (6)), including historically black colleges and universities and minority educational institutions.

General reduction.—The Committee recommendation restores $20,000,000 of the House general reduction of $52,000,000. The Committee intends that the Department have full discretion in allocating any general reduction in this appropriation account.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-N-413 Improved UF6 containment.............	---	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
Subtotal, Construction.........................	48,800,000	47,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations & support...	1,045,600,000	1,241,400,000	1,241,400,000	1,241,400,000
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses.............................	118,600,000	136,900,000	136,900,000	121,900,000
Capital equipment..............................	5,000,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	8,100,000
Construction:				
90-N-503 General plant projects...............	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
89-N-503 General plant projects...............	3,400,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction......................	3,400,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation....	127,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	131,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses	---	50,500,000	50,500,000	50,500,000
D. Program direction - OE	4,000,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,176,600,000	1,445,000,000	1,445,000,000	1,428,000,000
Use of Prior Year Balances	-43,520,000	---	---	---
Revenues	-1,276,000,000	-1,445,000,000	-1,500,900,000	-1,500,900,000
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	-142,920,000	---	-55,900,000	-72,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(-212,920,000)	(-68,200,000)	(-124,100,000)	(-139,100,000)
(Capital equipment)	(17,800,000)	(20,100,000)	(20,100,000)	(18,100,000)
(Construction)	(52,200,000)	(48,100,000)	(48,100,000)	(48,100,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	123,806,000	133,070,000	133,070,000	133,070,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	256,600,000	277,670,000	277,670,000	267,670,000
Capital equipment	75,750,000	81,200,000	81,200,000	81,200,000
Construction:				
90-R-101 AIP	---	14,855,000	14,855,000	14,855,000
90-R-104 Fermilab Linac Upgrade Project	---	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
89-R-101 AIP	11,700,000	---	---	---
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	11,068,000	13,410,000	13,410,000	13,410,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-R-104 Ctrl Computing Upgrade (FERMILAB)..	3,632,000	---	---	---
86-R-105 AGS Accumulator/Booster............	14,000,000	4,985,000	4,985,000	4,985,000
Subtotal, Construction......................	40,400,000	37,950,000	37,950,000	37,950,000
Subtotal, Facility operations..................	372,750,000	396,820,000	396,820,000	386,820,000
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses............................	66,200,000	82,040,000	77,040,000	77,040,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE..................	4,050,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
Subtotal, High energy physics........................	566,806,000	616,230,000	611,230,000	601,230,000
(Operating expenses)...............................	(446,606,000)	(492,780,000)	(487,780,000)	(477,780,000)
(Capital equipment)...............................	(79,800,000)	(85,500,000)	(85,500,000)	(85,500,000)
(Construction)......................................	(40,400,000)	(37,950,000)	(37,950,000)	(37,950,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses............................	87,150,000	93,700,000	93,700,000	94,700,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses............................	68,650,000	71,500,000	71,500,000	71,500,000
C. Low energy physics				
Operating expenses............................	26,300,000	27,400,000	27,400,000	27,400,000
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses............................	11,000,000	12,700,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
E. Capital equipment............................	17,100,000	18,500,000	18,500,000	18,500,000

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 1989	$369,832,000
Budget estimate, 1990	500,000,000
House allowance	424,700,000
Committee recommendation	350,000,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 provide for the development, construction, and operation of a repository for the disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent fuel. The law also establishes the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance these activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of the waste. In fiscal year 1990, the fund will generate revenues of $733,300,000 derived from fees and interest income.

The goal of the nuclear waste disposal fund program is to construct, license, and operate a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities in a manner that is safe and environmentally acceptable and in conformance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987. Yucca Mountain, NV, has been designated as the site for detailed site characterization activities. If the Nevada site is found suitable after completion of site characterization, the site will be recommended for development as a repository and a license application will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Upon completion of the Commission's review of the license application, if the Commission finds reasonable assurance that the public health and safety will be protected, the Department of Energy would be authorized to construct a repository at the Yucca Mountain site.

The overall budget request for this activity is $500,000,000 including $10,000,000 for analysis of a monitored retrievable storage site. The allowance provides $350,000,000, reflecting a reduction of $150,000,000 from the budget request. Of the $350,000,000 provided, only $325,000,000 is available immediately and $25,000,000 is available only subject to prior approval of the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and subject to certification by the Secretary of Energy that he has restructured and streamlined the program in a way that will allow site characterization to move forward in a timely fashion. Such certification shall also include a statement that necessary regulatory approval has been obtained to allow site characterization and at-depth field work to move forward. The Committee has proposed the overall reduction of $150,000,000 from the budget request because of its concern over excessive expenditures due to overhead, an overly burdensome management structure, and duplicative or unnecessary contractual arrangements. The Committee believes that an effective and successful program can be carried out within the recommended allowance of $350,000,000. The Committee intends that appropriate reductions be made by cutting overhead and by eliminating overlapping or duplicative efforts within the headquarters operation. The Committee does not intend that this reduction be made in the scientific or technical program related to Yucca Mountain.

The nuclear waste program demands priority attention within the Department, and the Committee directs the Secretary to move quickly to provide leadership direction, establish clear and effective line management, and eliminate duplicative or unnecessary contractual arrangements. The Committee reiterates its belief that early and timely progress on this program is critical and directs the Department to take all steps necessary within its authority to carry out the mandate of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended.

The Committee notes with concern the recent enactment of Nevada Assembly Bill 222, making it unlawful for any person or governmental entity to store high-level radioactive waste in Nevada. The Committee believes, however, that NAB 222 would be preempted by Federal law. The Committee, therefore, reiterates its commitment to the implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, and directs the Department to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that the mandated site characterization program will be carried out in a timely manner. The Committee believes that it is only through conduct of the detailed site characterization and testing program that the Yucca Mountain will ultimately be proven either suitable or unsuitable for development as a repository.

The Committee does not believe that enactment of Nevada Assembly Bill 222 should be an obstacle to continued field site characterization work, including at-depth experimentation and testing in an exploratory shaft facility, at the Yucca Mountain site. The Committee understands, however, that continued field work is dependent upon issuance of certain environmental permits, in particular an air quality surface disturbance permit, by the State of Nevada. The Committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to work with the State of Nevada toward issuance of these environmental permits and to pursue vigorously any and all other necessary steps to allow field work to move forward.

Until such time as the obstacles to continued field work are removed, the Committee believes that it is appropriate to limit expenditures from the Nuclear Waste Fund, including those provided to the State of Nevada and to affected local governments. Therefore, the Committee has provided not more than $5,000,000 to the State of Nevada for conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended. An additional amount of not to exceed $6,000,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada for conduct of oversight activities, to be available at the discretion of the Secretary of Energy based upon his certification to Congress of good faith efforts and cooperation on the part of the State in allowing technical field work, including at-depth testing in an exploratory shaft facility, to proceed at the Yucca Mountain site. The Committee has provided not more than $5,000,000 to affected local governments for conduct of appropriate activities pursuant to the act.

The Committee recommendation provides that up to $10,000,000 shall be made available to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas [UNLV], to provide a computing resource to the State of Nevada to carry out its independent analyses and oversight responsibilities under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and for use by UNLV.

The funds shall be made available by direct payment to UNLV in the amount of the purchase price of a supercomputer or coupled minisupercomputers. UNLV shall take title to and assume ownership of the computer hardware and software that are purchased with these funds. Funds made available under this section may be used for a mainframe, I/O subsystem, disk drive units, front end processor and peripherals as well as the required system software, third party software to provide user functionality, shipping, and installation. Facility preparation, telecommunications, ongoing staffing, operation, utilities, and maintenance are expected to be the responsibility of UNLV.

ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	$16,243,000
House allowance	16,243,000
Committee recommendation	16,243,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,243,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This new account proposed by the administration funds activities historically funded in the "Departmental administration" account and in the "Energy supply, research and development" account. The administration has proposed to establish the isotope production and distribution fund in order to bring together the various funding for isotope production into a single account. It is proposed that this appropriation treatment will improve the management of the activity and contribute to a more business-like approach.

The Committee shares the concern of the administration that the management of this activity has not been satisfactory. The Department produces isotopes that are key to a number of U.S. industries including the multimillion dollar nuclear medicine industry.

Until recently the Department had not established the responsibility for the management of this effort. The production of isotopes was managed by four headquarters and seven field office organizations. The operation was basically not managed by any organization but rather a minor portion of various organization responsibilities.

As a result of expressed Committee concerns, the Department established an organization to manage and direct the isotope production and distribution enterprize under the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Energy. The Committee continues to urge the Department to assure sufficient management attention is devoted to this important responsibility.

Within 90 days of enactment of this act, the Department of Energy should report to the Committees on Appropriations. The report should include the Department's policy with regard to production and sales of isotopes; the condition of the production facilities and plans for replacement of aging facilities; the expected requirements with regard to environmental and waste treatment efforts; and the details of the financial plans for full-cost recovery of the isotope production and distribution.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$6,695,925,000
Budget estimate, 1990	7,588,487,000
House allowance	7,933,487,000
Committee recommendation	7,787,790,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1989	$1,404,075,000
Budget estimate, 1990	1,798,513,000
House allowance	1,758,813,000
Committee recommendation	1,766,308,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $9,554,098,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management, and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee notes that the Department of Energy is pursuing a new and innovative technology commercialization initiative. The Committee applauds the initiative and believes it will greatly enhance U.S. competitiveness by drawing on the significant investment in the Department's high technology defense capabilities through cooperative arrangements with the U.S. private sector. The Committee urges the Department to proceed with this technology commercialization initiative in fiscal year 1990.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

This program provides for the research, development, engineering, testing, and production of all U.S. nuclear weapons; maintenance of reliable weapons for their stockpile life; and retirement and disposal of nuclear weapons from the stockpile. The fiscal year 1990 recommendation will continue efforts to provide new technology to maintain a modern nuclear force, along with the design and development of new weapons systems in response to defense requirements.

The Committee recommendation for weapons activities totals $4,580,007,000 of which $3,754,573,000 is operating expenses and $825,434,000 is for plant and capital equipment.

Weapons activities are comprised of the following subcategories: research and development, testing activities, production and surveillance, and program direction.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,364,015,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $43,536,000 over the 1989 level and $19,830,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes not to exceed $1,500,000 for phase I of LLNL and Sandia-Livermore Labs share of transportation improvements needed to meet anticipated future laboratory demands on the local road system.

Testing.—The Committee recommendation for testing activities totals $568,980,000 which reflects a reduction of $30,975,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,637,000 for the Marshall Islands radiological activities including: $1,644,000 for logistical support; $1,928,000 for the medical program, including whole-body counting and plutonium bioassay and referrals; $1,750,000 for the environmental studies of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, including Rongelap; and $315,000 for capital equipment and technical support. The Committee expects the Department to continue these efforts in future years (at the current level of activity and as adjusted for inflation) in order to verify that the people of the affected islands will continue to be safe from the effects of previous U.S. testing and to protect the United States from the risks of future legal claims. The Committee expects the Department to continue to cooperate with the Marshallese affected by the testing program, including providing for external review of the Department's activities.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation for production and surveillance totals $2,547,374,000, a reduction of $7,097,000 below the budget request.

Nuclear directed energy weapons.—The Committee recommendation for nuclear directed energy weapons is $200,000,000, a reduction of $66,000,000 as directed by the authorization bill.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommendation for inertial confinement fusion [ICF] is $189,240,000 which includes a recommendation of $165,200,000 for operating expenses and $24,040,000 for capital equipment.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production Program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and nondefense requirements. In addition, materials production sustains a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential nuclear weapons stockpile memorandum and the annual Department of Energy materials management plan.

The materials production program operates a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River, Richland, and Idaho, and support facilities. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes. For fiscal year 1990, activities associated with new production reactors have been removed from this program and are contained in a separate program.

The Committee agrees with the observations, directions, and comments of the House Committee as follows: The Committee has observed over the past year the reporting of serious problems involving the safe and environmentally sound operation of the Materials Production Complex. These problems have caused great concern. Associated with these problems have been considerable discussions both inside and outside the Department of how to solve them.

The Committee is providing the increased funds included in the budget request to address these problems; however, additional money cannot be expected to solve all of the problems. The Committee expects that safety attitudes, environmental criteria, production goals, technical understanding and technical criteria are all managed in a way that enhances environment, health and safety concerns as production goals are strived for.

The Committee notes that the Secretary is making use of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Safety until the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board is operational. To insure full knowledge of the Department's plans and the Advisory Committee's recommendation on these plans, the Committee directs the Department to continue to notify and provide copies to the Committee of: (1) all the Department's proposals to the Advisory Committee, (2) all the Advisory Committee recommendations regarding these proposals, and (3) the Department's plans on implementing the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

The Committee understands there are many technical issues associated with the restart of the reactors at the Savannah River site. Conducting some types of analysis, such as ultrasonic reactor vessel testing, are under consideration and if accomplished, would require considerable time and expense. The Committee strongly urges the Department to not compromise safety as it evaluates the various analysis necessary for safe reactor restart.

The Committee is pleased with the openness the Department is pursuing with regard to its current operations as well as past activities. The Committee feels this is an important ingredient to a sound relationship with State and local entities. In the area of emergency planning, the Committee directs the Department to assure that State and local officials receive immediate notification of any releases of radionuclides or of any spills of hazardous contaminants.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $2,138,574,000 which is $75,000,000 below the budget request and $20,000,000 less than the House allowance.

The Materials Production Program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor operations, processing of nuclear materials, supporting services, enriched material, capital equipment, and program direction.

The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request and recommended authorization in all subcategories.

DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The Defense Waste and Environmental Restoration Program includes near-term and longer term activities to assure that existing and future nuclear waste from Federal Government program activities can be isolated from the biosphere and pose no significant threat to public health and safety. For the near term, the wastes are managed through interim storage facilities. Simultaneous efforts are proceeding on development of technology and processes for long-term disposal.

The defense waste and environmental restoration program provides safe interim storage, processing, transportation, and ultimate disposal of radioactive and hazardous waste generated primarily from nuclear materials production and naval propulsion programs. The program also provides for environmental restoration of inactive hazardous or radioactive waste sites and facilities at all Defense programs installations under requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [CERCLA], as amended in 1986, and section 3004(u) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA]. The program directs the DOE-wide transportation and traffic management support effort; including research and development, packaging policy, and interaction with the carriers and regulatory agencies regarding shipment of radioactive and other hazardous materials, except explosives.

The Committee agrees with the House Committee and likewise commends the administration for the significant increase in the budget for defense waste clean up activities. During these times of fiscal austerity coupled with modernization needs, identification of sufficient funds for clean up is a difficult task. However, the Committee feels it is appropriate to increase funding for this activity to further address this pressing need. Funds for significant clean up work are still premature, yet these costs loom in future years. While the Committee commends the administration for its effort in providing significant increases above last year, the real challenge will be to recommend a high level of funding when the clean up activities get in full swing. Therefore, the Committee strongly urges the administration to follow through in future years with an adequately funded, technically sound, efficient and effective clean up program.

The Committee recommendation provides $1,571,731,000 for defense waste and environmental restoration. This is an increase of $280,000,000 over the budget request and $607,000,000 over fiscal year 1989. The Committee could not provide more funds for this effort due to lower budget allocations for this defense function.

Environmental restoration.—The Committee recommendation includes $551,293,000 or $150,000,000 greater than the budget request for this activity. This amount is $391,968,000 greater than the fiscal year 1989 appropriated amount.

The Committee has included an additional $150,000,000 to this account to increase the amount of environmental restoration activities. Specific site allocations have not been made. The Committee agrees with the House and directs the Department to use some of this increased funding for those sites where contamination is currently spreading and where taking immediate action is warranted to halt this spread and/or to save money in the future if the spread were halted now. Also, increased funds are provided for wells to monitor ground water.

The Committee also agrees with the House and is concerned about the impacts existing defense waste sites have had or might have on our Nation's ground water. The expeditious permanent isolation and containment of contaminants in the soil placed there through the operation of seepage basins needs to be accomplished to protect ground water. These types of situations exist at many DOE sites. In particular, the Committee is concerned with the situ-

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Construction:				
90-R-AIP	---	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
89-R-201 AIP	4,300,000	---	---	---
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	3,700,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, Virginia	44,500,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
Subtotal Construction	52,500,000	74,000,000	74,000,000	74,000,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	264,100,000	299,300,000	299,300,000	300,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(193,100,000)	(205,300,000)	(205,300,000)	(206,300,000)
(Capital equipment)	(18,500,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)
(Construction)	(52,500,000)	(74,000,000)	(74,000,000)	(74,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. General Science program direction - OE	3,210,000	3,901,000	3,901,000	3,901,000
IV. Superconducting Super Collider				
A. Research and development				
Operating expenses	84,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000
Capital equipment	16,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
Construction:				
90-R-106 Superconducting Super Collider	---	160,000,000	110,000,000	135,000,000
Subtotal, Superconducting super collider	100,000,000	250,000,000	200,000,000	225,000,000
(Operating expenses)	84,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000
(Capital equipment)	(16,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)
(Construction)	---	(160,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(135,000,000)
Subtotal, General science and research	934,116,000	1,169,431,000	1,114,431,000	1,130,431,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
General Reduction	-12,000,000	---	-52,000,000	-32,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	922,116,000	1,169,431,000	1,062,431,000	1,098,431,000
(Operating expenses)	(717,578,000)	(770,981,000)	(730,240,000)	(724,981,000)
(Capital equipment)	(112,832,000)	(126,500,000)	(120,597,000)	(126,500,000)
(Construction)	(91,706,000)	(271,950,000)	(211,594,000)	(246,950,000)

ation at the Savannah River site [SRS]. The Committee directs the Department to formulate a plan, including a schedule, for the permanent isolation and containment/removal of the contaminants of the seepage basins at SRS. The recommended actions of the plan should be formulated in a way to provide assurance that radioactive or hazardous materials cannot migrate into surface water or ground water. The Department should provide this report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by December 15, 1989.

The Committee understands that the past waste disposal practices of the Department have caused a threat to and/or have denigrated ground water supplies. This may have not been anticipated when disposal activities actually occurred, nonetheless contamination has occurred and must now be addressed and further negative impacts must be avoided. At the Savannah River site, the Committee is concerned that the Department may not have sufficient information to fully characterize ground water contamination. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to enhance monitoring in and around the Savannah River site to assure ground water protection. This monitoring should be sufficient to evaluate all aquifers in sufficient quantity and extent. Offsite migration is a serious concern and monitoring at offsite locations including Georgia should be accomplished.

Waste operations and projects.—The Committee recommendation is $810,133,000 or $75,000,000 greater than the budget request. This amount is $83,931,000 greater than the amount included in the fiscal year 1989 appropriation.

The Committee has included $75,000,000 above the budget request to enhance waste operations activities to better assure that the ongoing activities of the Department are in conformance with applicable requirements.

In light of the Savannah River and West Valley experience and budget constraints, the Committee is concerned with the current cost estimate and cost effectiveness of the proposed Hanford vitrification project which is estimated to cost over $1,000,000,000. Therefore, the Department is to conduct a feasibility study to verify existing cost estimates of the current Hanford project design and technology with alternative technology and determine if an alternative technology could provide savings. Further, the Secretary is to advise the Committee by letter, report, or testimony during the next budget cycle of his findings and determinations in connection with this matter.

Waste research and development.—The Committee recommendation is $115,225,000 or $25,000,000 greater than the budget request. This amount is $56,765,000 greater than the amount included in the fiscal year 1989 amount.

The increased funds should enable the development of new techniques for elimination of the problems associated with waste cleanup. These new techniques should lower the overall cleanup costs and provide better assurance that these contaminants are in fact isolated.

NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS

The full amount requested, $303,500,000 for the new production reactor capacity is included in the recommendation. This is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $652,000,000 for the Naval Reactor Development Program, the same as the budget and House bill.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, testing, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $169,878,000 which is $20,000,000 more than the budget request.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $87,208,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $41,200,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
I. WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
A. Research and development				
1. Research and development - Core				
Operating expenses.........................	780,500,000	807,770,000	807,770,000	802,770,000
Capital equipment...........................	89,730,000	93,875,000	93,875,000	93,875,000
Construction:				
90-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	---	20,730,000	20,730,000	20,730,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
89-D-101 General plant projects, various locations (portion in Testing).....	19,500,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-105 Special nuclear materials R&D laboratory replacement, LANL, Los Alamos, N	22,000,000	44,000,000	44,000,000	44,000,000
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	60,352,000	75,400,000	75,400,000	75,400,000
85-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization Phase I, various locations	6,800,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	108,652,000	141,130,000	141,130,000	141,130,000
Subtotal, Research and development - Weapons	978,882,000	1,042,775,000	1,042,775,000	1,037,775,000
2. Nuclear directed energy weapons				
Operating expenses	113,790,000	117,700,000	117,700,000	85,000,000
Capital equipment	8,000,000	8,430,000	8,430,000	6,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, (NDER facility at LLNL)..........	12,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
86-D-104 Strategic defenses facility, SNLA.	3,237,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction......................	15,237,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons.......	137,027,000	145,130,000	145,130,000	110,000,000
3. Inertial fusion				
Operating expenses........................	155,530,000	160,200,000	160,200,000	165,200,000
Capital equipment.........................	8,240,000	8,740,000	24,040,000	24,040,000
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	163,770,000	168,940,000	184,240,000	189,240,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
4. Environment, safety & health				
Construction:				
90-D-103 ES&H Improvements various locations........................	---	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,700,000
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewater systems consolidation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	7,600,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
88-D-103 Seismic upgrade-Blds 111, LLNL ...	5,400,000	---	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatmen facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	12,000,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health..........	25,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
5. Safeguards & security				
Construction:				
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade, Phase II, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	7,300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement II, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Subtotal, Safeguards & security	15,800,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Subtotal, Research and development	1,320,479,000	1,383,845,000	1,399,145,000	1,364,015,000
B. Testing				
1. Testing - Core				
Operating expenses	410,000,000	421,700,000	421,700,000	421,700,000
Capital equipment	38,161,000	40,420,000	40,420,000	40,420,000
Construction:				
90-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	---	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	7,000,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Subtotal, weapons program	455,161,000	469,520,000	469,520,000	469,520,000
2. Nuclear directed energy weapons				
Operating expenses	108,464,000	110,900,000	110,900,000	82,000,000
Capital equipment	9,509,000	10,075,000	10,075,000	8,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	117,973,000	120,975,000	120,975,000	90,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
3. Safeguards & security				
Construction:				
85-D-105 Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, NV	12,200,000	9,460,000	9,460,000	9,460,000
Subtotal, Testing	585,334,000	599,955,000	599,955,000	568,980,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,905,813,000	1,983,800,000	1,999,100,000	1,932,995,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,568,284,000)	(1,618,270,000)	(1,618,270,000)	(1,556,670,000)
(Capital equipment)	(153,640,000)	(161,540,000)	(176,840,000)	(172,335,000)
(Construction)	(183,889,000)	(203,990,000)	(203,990,000)	(203,990,000)
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	1,909,445,000	2,104,097,000	2,104,097,000	2,100,000,000
Capital equipment	118,614,000	125,600,000	125,600,000	125,600,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
Decision costs - construction:				
90-D-122 Production capabilities for the nuclear depth/strike bomb (ND/SB), various locations	---	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
90-D-123 Follow on to lance warhead production facilities, various locations	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	---
missile (SICBM) warhead production facs, various locations	---	---	---	---
87-D-122 Short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations	26,000,000	41,200,000	41,200,000	41,200,000
Subtotal, Decision costs - construction	26,000,000	52,200,000	52,200,000	49,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Production base - construction:				
Facilities capability assurance program:				
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	79,341,000	83,099,000	83,099,000	83,099,000
Production support facilities:				
90-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	---	30,850,000	30,850,000	30,850,000
90-D-124 High explosives (HE) synthesis facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
89-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	29,194,000	---	---	---
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....................	2,000,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-125 Plutonium recovery modification project (Blds. 371), Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	4,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	13,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, SC	31,800,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,281,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Production support facilities	81,275,000	146,875,000	146,875,000	146,875,000
Subtotal, Production base - construction	160,616,000	229,974,000	229,974,000	229,974,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Environment, safety & health:				
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
90-D-126 ES&H Enhancements various locations........................	---	26,700,000	26,700,000	26,700,000
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	800,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrading, various locations..................................	6,500,000	5,400,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring laboratories, various locations	5,000,000	---	---	---
86-D-123 Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	5,203,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	4,775,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health	22,278,000	37,100,000	37,100,000	37,100,000
Safeguards & security:				
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	7,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	2,775,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Safeguards & security	10,275,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	219,169,000	324,774,000	324,774,000	321,774,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,247,228,000	2,554,471,000	2,554,471,000	2,547,374,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	72,166,000	88,853,000	88,853,000	88,853,000
2. Community assistance	9,234,000	9,050,000	9,050,000	9,050,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	81,400,000	97,903,000	97,903,000	97,903,000
Capital equipment	---	1,735,000	1,735,000	1,735,000
Subtotal, Program direction	81,400,000	99,638,000	99,638,000	99,638,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,234,441,000	4,637,909,000	4,653,209,000	4,580,007,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,559,129,000)	(3,820,270,000)	(3,820,270,000)	(3,754,573,000)
(Capital equipment)	(272,254,000)	(288,875,000)	(304,175,000)	(299,670,000)
(Construction)	(403,058,000)	(528,764,000)	(528,764,000)	(525,764,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. MATERIALS PRODUCTION				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses	562,976,000	578,049,000	578,049,000	578,049,000
Construction:				
Environment, safety & health projects:				
90-D-142 Coal storage facility environmental upgrade, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	920,000	920,000	920,000
90-D-150 Reactor safety assurance, Savannah River, SC	---	12,700,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	3,600,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	1,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
89-D-148 Improved reactor confinement system Savannah River, SC........................	2,000,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	6,000,000	3,164,000	3,164,000	3,164,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects......................	12,600,000	71,684,000	71,684,000	71,684,000
Subtotal, Construction......................	12,600,000	71,684,000	71,684,000	71,684,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations....................	575,576,000	649,733,000	649,733,000	649,733,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	511,717,000	589,609,000	589,609,000	589,609,000
Construction:				
Programmatic projects:				
86-D-148 Special isotope separation project, Idaho Falls, ID	28,000,000	115,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
90-D-141 Idaho chemical processing plant fire protection, Idaho Falls, ID	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
90-D-143 Plutonium finishing plant fire safety and loss limitation, Richland, WA	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects	---	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Construction	28,000,000	119,300,000	44,300,000	44,300,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	539,717,000	708,909,000	633,909,000	633,909,000
C. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	259,679,000	282,868,000	282,868,000	282,868,000
Construction:				
Programmatic projects:				
90-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	---	36,802,000	36,802,000	36,802,000
90-D-151 Engineering Ctr, Savannah River, SC	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
89-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	35,260,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phase I, II, III, IV and V, various location	72,140,000	81,780,000	81,780,000	81,780,000
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuel Processing Facility, INEL, ID	50,100,000	55,000,000	75,000,000	55,000,000
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV, & V, various locations	5,879,000	---	---	---
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
Subtotal, programmatic projects................	163,379,000	180,582,000	200,582,000	180,582,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, phase I, Savannah River, SC	---	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
87-D-152 Environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, SC..........................	2,224,000	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH ...	50,000,000	55,111,000	55,111,000	55,111,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects........................	52,224,000	60,011,000	60,011,000	60,011,000
Safeguards & security projects:				
89-D-140 Additional separations safeguards, Savannah River, SC	5,300,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	10,300,000
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC.........................	5,700,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	12,800,000	6,181,000	6,181,000	6,181,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements, plantwide, Savannah River, SC	11,584,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, safeguards & security projects......	35,384,000	22,881,000	22,881,000	22,881,000
Subtotal, Construction..........................	250,987,000	263,474,000	283,474,000	263,474,000
Subtotal, Supporting services....................	510,666,000	546,342,000	566,342,000	546,342,000
D. Enriched material	169,000,000	168,900,000	168,900,000	168,900,000
E. Capital equipment	102,500,000	104,425,000	104,425,000	104,425,000
F. Program direction...........................	28,400,000	35,265,000	35,265,000	35,265,000
TOTAL, MATERIALS PRODUCTION.......................	1,925,859,000	2,213,574,000	2,158,574,000	2,138,574,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).................................	(1,531,772,000)	(1,654,691,000)	(1,654,691,000)	(1,654,691,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(102,500,000)	(104,425,000)	(104,425,000)	(104,425,000)
(Construction).................................	(291,587,000)	(454,458,000)	(399,458,000)	(379,458,000)
III. DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION				
A. Environmental restoration - operating expenses	159,325,000	401,293,000	636,293,000	551,293,000
B. Waste operations and projects				
Operating expenses............................	532,042,000	568,167,000	643,167,000	643,167,000
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
90-D-170 GPP, various locations...............	---	29,036,000	29,036,000	29,036,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-170 General plant projects, waste operations and projects, and waste research and development, various locations	28,000,000	---	---	---
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	4,000,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	3,570,000	9,360,000	9,360,000	9,360,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	22,500,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	29,100,000
87-D-173 242-A Evaporator crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA	1,944,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
87-D-180 Burial ground expansion, Savannah River, SC	2,068,000	---	---	---
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC	6,371,000	2,790,000	2,790,000	2,790,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC............................	92,462,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, programmatic projects.................	160,865,000	78,386,000	78,386,000	78,386,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	---	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	---	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	---	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
90-D-177 RWMC Transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, Idaho........	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment buildings, Idaho............................	---	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	12,000,000	27,600,000	27,600,000	27,600,000
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	1,800,000	15,400,000	15,400,000	15,400,000
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	3,500,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-177 Test reactor area liquid radioactive waste cleanup system, Phase III, INEL, ID ...	911,000	---	---	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	13,000,000	14,140,000	14,140,000	14,140,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects........................	31,211,000	88,580,000	88,580,000	88,580,000
Safeguards & security projects:				
86-D-175 INEL security upgrade, ID...........	2,084,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	194,160,000	166,966,000	166,966,000	166,966,000
Subtotal, Waste operations and projects...........	726,202,000	735,133,000	810,133,000	810,133,000
C. Waste research and development.................	58,460,000	90,225,000	115,225,000	115,225,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Hazardous waste and compliance technology......	8,377,000	10,163,000	10,163,000	40,163,000
E. Transportation management......................	9,720,000	11,841,000	11,841,000	11,841,000
F. Capital equipment............................	52,716,000	50,126,000	50,126,000	50,126,000
G. Program direction............................	3,100,000	2,950,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
Use of prior year AEDA balances	-43,000,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE WASTE & ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION......	974,900,000	1,301,731,000	1,636,731,000	1,581,731,000
(Operating expenses)..............................	(728,024,000)	(1,084,639,000)	(1,419,639,000)	(1,364,639,000)
(Capital equipment)...............................	(52,716,000)	(50,126,000)	(50,126,000)	(50,126,000)
(Construction)................................	(194,160,000)	(166,966,000)	(166,966,000)	(166,966,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS				
A. New production reactor support				
Operating expenses..............................	60,000,000	203,500,000	203,500,000	203,500,000
Construction:				
88-D-154 New production reactor capacity, various locations (design only)...............	---	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
TOTAL, NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS........................	60,000,000	303,500,000	303,500,000	303,500,000
(Operating expenses).................................	(60,000,000)	(203,500,000)	(203,500,000)	(203,500,000)
(Construction)................................	---	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$396,503,000
Budget estimate, 1990	405,365,000
House allowance	355,461,000
Committee recommendation	354,297,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1989	$7,162,000
Budget estimate, 1990	3,273,000
House allowance	3,273,000
Committee recommendation	3,273,000

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $204,297,000 for departmental administration.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (5) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

Within the exception of those items changed in the Committee recommendation, the Committee interposes no objection to the use of prior year unobligated balances to offset funding requirements within the "Departmental administration" account.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses..............................	83,000,000	87,000,000	87,000,000	87,000,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses..............................	236,700,000	245,300,000	245,300,000	245,300,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses..............................	222,700,000	217,000,000	217,000,000	217,000,000
D. Capital equipment..............................	48,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000
E. Construction:				
90-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	---	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	---	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
90-N-103 Advanced test reactor off-gas treatment system, INEL, ID	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
90-N-104 Facility renovations, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory (KAPL), Niskayuna, NY	---	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
89-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,000,000	---	---	---
89-N-102 Heat transfer test facility, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY	2,800,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
89-N-103 Advanced test reactor modifications Test Reactor Area, INEL, ID	1,600,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
89-N-104 Power system upgrade, Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho Falls, ID	600,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID........	5,900,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
88-N-103 Material handling and storage modifications, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY..........	2,700,000	---	---	---
88-N-104 Prototype availability facilities, KAPL, Kesselring Site, West Milton, NY	6,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction..........................	26,600,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000
F. Program direction	13,000,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT.....................	630,000,000	652,000,000	652,000,000	652,000,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(555,400,000)	(562,800,000)	(562,800,000)	(562,800,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(48,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)
(Construction)................................	(26,600,000)	(35,200,000)	(35,200,000)	(35,200,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VI. OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
A. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	146,200,000	139,146,000	149,146,000	159,146,000
Capital equipment	8,400,000	9,732,000	9,732,000	9,732,000
Construction:				
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	154,600,000	149,878,000	159,878,000	169,878,000
(Operating expenses)	(146,200,000)	(139,146,000)	(149,146,000)	(159,146,000)
(Capital equipment)	(8,400,000)	(9,732,000)	(9,732,000)	(9,732,000)
(Construction)	---	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	75,400,000	82,241,000	82,241,000	82,241,000
Capital equipment	4,800,000	4,967,000	4,967,000	4,967,000
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	80,200,000	87,208,000	87,208,000	87,208,000
(Operating expenses)	(75,400,000)	(82,241,000)	(82,241,000)	(82,241,000)
(Capital equipment)	(4,800,000)	(4,967,000)	(4,967,000)	(4,967,000)
C. Security investigations - OE	40,000,000	41,200,000	41,200,000	41,200,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS	274,800,000	278,286,000	288,286,000	298,286,000
(Operating expenses)	(261,600,000)	(262,587,000)	(272,587,000)	(282,587,000)
(Capital equipment)	(13,200,000)	(14,699,000)	(14,699,000)	(14,699,000)
(Construction)	---	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES..............	8,100,000,000	9,387,000,000	9,692,300,000	9,554,098,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(6,695,925,000)	(7,588,487,000)	(7,933,487,000)	(7,822,790,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(488,670,000)	(512,125,000)	(527,425,000)	(522,920,000)
(Construction)................................	(915,405,000)	(1,286,388,000)	(1,231,388,000)	(1,208,388,000)

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	$22,959,000
House allowance	22,959,000
Committee recommendation	22,959,000

As required by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, the Office of Inspector General is proposed as a separate appropriation.

This appropriation provides agencywide audit and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement. The audits function provides internal audit, contract audit, and inspections services.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95-91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration. Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements. All of the other power marketing administrations are funded annually with appropriations, and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses..	2,204,000	2,140,000	2,140,000	2,100,000
II. General management - Personnel Compensation and Benefits....................................	158,533,000	154,138,000	154,138,000	154,100,000
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Travel....................................	5,625,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,000,000
B. Services..................................	138,017,000	131,299,000	131,299,000	131,299,000
C. Capital equipment.........................	7,162,000	3,273,000	3,273,000	3,273,000
Subtotal, Other expenses............................	150,804,000	140,672,000	140,672,000	140,572,000
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies...........	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
B. Consumer Affairs............................	67,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
C. Public Affairs..............................	260,000	269,000	269,000	269,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Competition....................................	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
E. International Policy Studies..................	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
F. Office of Minority Economic Impact............	3,500,000	2,741,000	3,500,000	2,741,000
Subtotal, Program support........................	7,477,000	6,725,000	7,484,000	6,725,000
Subtotal, administrative operations..............	319,018,000	303,675,000	304,434,000	303,497,000
V. Cost of work for others.......................	129,030,000	134,562,000	83,899,000	83,899,000
VI. Miscellaneous revenues.......................	-240,725,000	-228,715,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000
Subtotal, Departmental administration............	207,323,000	209,522,000	238,333,000	237,396,000
Use of unobligated balances - (MA)DA.............	-44,383,000	-29,599,000	-29,599,000	-33,099,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION...............	162,940,000	179,923,000	208,734,000	204,297,000
(Operating expenses).............................	(155,778,000)	(176,650,000)	(205,461,000)	(201,024,000)
(Capital equipment).............................	(7,162,000)	(3,273,000)	(3,273,000)	(3,273,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	3,279,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	3,145,000
Use of prior year balances	-120,000	---	---	---
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,159,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	3,145,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	2,647,000	2,337,000	2,337,000	2,337,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	33,620,000	40,032,000	16,132,000	16,132,000
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	36,267,000	42,369,000	18,469,000	18,469,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	14,815,000	17,316,000	17,316,000	17,316,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	7,936,000	7,020,000	7,020,000	7,020,000
C. Construction	5,838,000	9,236,000	9,236,000	9,236,000
Use of prior year balances	-13,200,000	-8,400,000	-8,400,000	-8,400,000
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	15,389,000	25,172,000	25,172,000	25,172,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation	94,252,000	93,517,000	93,517,000	93,517,000
B. System operation and maintenance	88,976,000	99,093,000	99,093,000	99,093,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Purchase power and wheeling	87,700,000	118,623,000	98,623,000	98,623,000
Transfer of permanent authority from DOI	---	(3,564,000)	(3,564,000)	(3,564,000)
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	270,928,000	311,233,000	291,233,000	291,233,000

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1989	$3,159,000
Budget estimate, 1990	3,145,000
House allowance	3,145,000
Committee recommendation	3,145,000

An appropriation of $3,145,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000 kilowatt Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160 kilowatt Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmissions system, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $133,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $275,000,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. BPA markets electric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. BPA also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system (14,653 circuit-miles of transmission line and 387 substations by the end of fiscal year 1990).

Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed BPA on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96-501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, BPA's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, to protect fish and wildlife resources, and to invest in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation and to acquire generating resources to meet these requirements.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on Bonneville's borrowing requirements. In addition to the cumulative $2,970,000,000 available to BPA through fiscal year 1990, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $258,200,000 in new borrowing authority in fiscal year 1990 for system planning and construction, energy conservation, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs for a total of $3,230,000,000, including any unused portion from prior years. This level would allow the proposed $232,000,000 capital program to be funded by borrowing authority and also provide $5,600,000 for continued construction of the rescoped Umatilla Hatchery, $15,500,000 for system reinforcements made necessary by more rapid load growth than anticipated, and $5,100,000 for capital system replacements.

Conservation.—BPA is a national leader in implementing least-cost energy plans. BPA has been pursuing the conservation objectives in the Northwest conservation and electric power plan, and should maintain least-cost planning as the cornerstone of resource acquisition and long-term rate stabilization in the Northwest. Acquisition of least-cost resources is critical to assure the lowest possible long-term rates to regional ratepayers and that Treasury payments are not jeopardized by expensive future resource acquisitions.

Given the declining surplus of electricity in the Northwest, the Committee is concerned that several objectives in the least-cost plan have not yet been achieved. BPA shall continue its efforts to increase staff and other support in fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for lost opportunity conservation programs, including pilot programs in the commercial and industrial sectors. The objective of these efforts should be to gain sufficient experience and capability so that in fiscal year 1992 BPA is able to operate programs designed to capture all cost effective lost opportunities in its customers' service territories. BPA should continue to work closely with and be guided by the act consistently with the Council's plan in developing conservation programs.

Hydro system efficiency.—The Committee strongly encourages BPA to continue its discussions with British Columbia Hydro aimed at better coordination of the Columbia and Peace River systems. The Committee has been informed that if it proves environmentally acceptable, agreement can result in up to 600 average megawatts of a low-cost, renewable energy resource that can prove of great benefit to both Canada and the United States. This approaches the average energy output of a nuclear plant and can be accomplished with no capital investment and no new construction.

Repayment.—The Committee is aware of the continuing efforts of BPA to improve its fiscal condition. In fiscal year 1988, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury $667,800,000, including $190,200,000 for amortization. At the end of fiscal year 1988, BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury. The Committee is pleased with BPA's actions to control costs and implement innovative marketing arrangements that will all aid in assuring the fiscal soundness of BPA. The Committee commends BPA for implementing its "Programs in Perspective Process" which provides the public an opportunity to discuss BPA's program objectives, strategies, funding levels, and priorities.

Limitation on direct loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1990, as requested in the budget. This level is adequate for BPA to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Fish enhancement facilities.—The Committee recommends approval of the administration proposals to construct the Northwest

Oregon Chinook Facility and Galbraith Springs/Sherman Creek Hatcheries. These projects will increase the supply of hatchery-produced salmon and steelhead for rivers in northeastern Oregon and elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest and also provide a stable supply of kokanee salmon for Banks Lake and Lake Roosevelt.

The Committee recommendation also includes $5,600,000 for construction of the rescoped Umatilla Hatchery consistent with final design plans and the Regional Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. The hatchery, located in eastern Oregon, was authorized in Public Law 98-360, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1985.

BPA's roll in bypass planning.—The Committee is encouraged by the Fish Spill Memorandum of Agreement signed by the fishery agencies, Indian tribes, and BPA. The Committee endorses the thrust of that agreement to improve fish survival and at the same time eliminate financial losses caused by spill. The Committee also supports BPA's efforts to implement juvenile fish bypass improvements in coordination with the Corps of Engineers and other regional interest groups. As well, the Committee encourages BPA to continue to coordinate a regional concensus on operation of the Mitchell Act hatcheries.

Pacific Intertie.—BPA funding to continue work on the third alternating current intertie is included in this budget. The Administrator has indicated BPA will not begin construction until appropriate actions by California participants have been taken. The Committee recognizes that, depending on when these actions are taken, BPA will not begin construction until appropriate actions by California participants have been taken. The Committee notes also that, depending on when these actions are taken, BPA's planned fiscal year 1989 design and equipment procurement activities may shift into fiscal years 1990 and 1991, potentially increasing the capital outlays and obligations in those years. BPA's fiscal year 1990 estimated use of borrowing authority, currently forecast at $62,000,000, is recommended by the Committee to assure that the Federal Government can expeditiously initiate and complete the construction of this project as authorized by Public Law 98-360. The Office of Management and Budget has agreed to this course of action and has agreed to assure adequate out-year borrowing authority to complete the intertie in a timely manner. The Committee recognizes that the fiscal year 1989, fiscal year 1990, and out-year amounts can change in accordance with changes in the schedule of the line, but believes strongly that the BPA's ability to move ahead with the line is key to providing confidence to financial markets and regulators such that the southern end of the line can also proceed on schedule. The Administrator should notify the Committee of any schedule changes and needed funding adjustments in the fiscal year 1991 submission or sooner if required.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1989	$36,267,000
Budget estimate, 1990	42,369,000
House allowance	18,469,000
Committee recommendation	18,469,000

The Committee recommendation concurs with House action which appropriates $18,469,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility of the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommends $18,469,000 for fiscal year 1990 which will provide for the continuation of the basic power marketing program. SEPA's budget request for purchase power and wheeling has been steadily increasing for several years. This rise was due to phasing-in of a policy of full cost of service for wheeling activities. These costs are fully recovered and therefore no net increase in expense was occurring. The Committee has learned that SEPA has recently concluded new wheeling agreements with several utilities would avoid a wheeling cost or expense to SEPA. Therefore, a $23,900,000 reduction to SEPA's budget request can be made without impact to its program.

The Department is seeking legislation to authorize the study of possible divestiture of SEPA. The SEPA budget request does not include any funds for this purpose nor does the recommended appropriation include any. The Committee reiterates its position that this proposed study and the actual divestiture of Southeastern require the enactment of appropriate authorizing legislation. To date, such legislation has not been enacted.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1989	$15,389,000
Budget estimate, 1990	25,172,000
House allowance	25,172,000
Committee recommendation	25,172,000

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $25,172,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskeg and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,355 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161 kilovolts, 138 volts, and 69 kilovolts wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 35 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,150,400 kilowatts.

The recommendation for fiscal year 1990 continues to reflect the availability for use of large amounts of unobligated appropriations from prior years.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1989	$270,928,000
Budget estimate, 1990	311,233,000
House allowance	291,233,000
Committee recommendation	291,233,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $291,233,000, which is the same as the House allowance and $20,000,000 below the budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of more than 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 252 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 51 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current maximum operating capacity of 10,385 megawatts.

The recommendation provides for the level of activity requested by WAPA in fiscal year 1990, but reflects an anticipated $20,000,000 savings over previous estimates, resulting in an appropriation of $291,233,000.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$108,760,000
Budget estimate, 1990	116,550,000
House allowance	116,550,000
Committee recommendation	116,550,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1989	$108,760,000
Budget estimate, 1990	116,550,000
House allowance	116,550,000
Committee recommendation	116,550,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

The Committee concurs with the House action in recommending $116,550,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95-91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the departmental request.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

Appropriations, 1989	$75,000
Budget estimate, 1990	75,000
House allowance	75,000
Committee recommendation	75,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $75,000. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Geothermal Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95-238).

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1989	$110,700,000
Budget estimate, 1990	
House allowance	110,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

The Committee recommends $150,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] activities, including salaries and expenses. This is the same as the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Within the amount recommended for Appalachian regional development programs, the Committee has provided $40,000,000 for Corridor G and H.

The Committee recognizes the economic potential for tourism throughout Appalachia and encourages the Appalachian Regional Commission to establish a program for the identification of effective tourism development methods and strategies that can be utilized by tourism organizations and the tourism industry throughout the Appalachian region. Both Concord College and West Virginia University have demonstrated expertise in this area and the ARC should work cooperatively with these educational institutions, Federal agencies and interested organizations to establish this tourism development mechanism in the region.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	
House allowance	$10,000,000
Committee recommendation	7,000,000

The Committee recommendation concurs with the House in provides $7,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Defense Nuclear Safety Board.

The Committee has recommended a $3,000,000 below the House allocation because it is unlikely that this new established Commission will be fully staffed in fiscal 1990.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the 1989 Defense Authorization Act. The Board, appointed by the President, advises the Secretary of Energy and reports to Congress on safety matters of the Department's defense nuclear reactors. The five member board is expected to eventually require a staff level of nearly 100 FTE's.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board is an independent board. A reimbursable financial arrangement through the Department of Energy would not foster this independence. The Board should not have to rely on the Department of Energy for financial resources. Accordingly, a separate appropriation account is established for this Board.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$205,000
Budget estimate, 1990	214,000
House allowance	214,000
Committee recommendation	214,000

An appropriation of $214,000 is recommended for the Delaware River Basin Commission salaries and expenses. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact (under Public Law 87-328) among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. The compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1989	$263,000
Budget estimate, 1990	345,000
House allowance	345,000
Committee recommendation	345,000

The Committee concurs with the House in recommending $345,000 for fiscal year 1990.

This appropriation provides the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expense budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission's expense budget for 1989 is $2,535,000.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1989	$379,000
Budget estimate, 1990	
House allowance	100,000
Committee recommendation	300,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $300,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. The increase over the budget allows the Commission to continue to work closely with the Corps of Engineers and the States on issues of mutual interest, with flood control receiving primary emphasis.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the States in the basin of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination, and assistance.

The additional amount over the $79,000 Federal share of the Commission's current expenses is to complete efforts related to Corps of Engineers flood control studies.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1989	$420,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	472,100,000
House allowance	442,100,000
Committee recommendation	442,100,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1989	$189,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	156,750,000
House allowance	146,850,000
Committee recommendation	146,850,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1989	$231,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	315,350,000
House allowance	295,250,000
Committee recommendation	295,250,000

A net appropriation of $295,250,000 is recommended for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The Committee notes that the administration proposed that $23,195,000 of the appropriation for the NRC be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. These funds are required to fund the NRC efforts focused on implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as amended in 1987 and DOE'S efforts to characterize the Yucca Mountain site. The administration also proposed appropriation language which includes a provision for collection of the authorized revenues of $156,750,000.

The Committee concurs with the House Committee and its report commending the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for its recent rulemaking on early site permits; standard design certification; and combined licenses for nuclear power reactors. This Committee has likewise urged the Commission to take action on these issues and believes the final rule to be a major step in making necessary improvements in the nuclear licensing process.

The rule will provide the framework for the resolution of design safety and siting issues prior to plant construction, a goal the Committee strongly supports. Once a combined license is issued authorizing construction and operation of a certified design, the Commission should assure that regulatory activity is focused on license conformance.

The Committee also agrees that national energy policy requires that a nuclear powerplant that has been constructed in accordance with a combined license should not be delayed from operation if its safe operation can be reasonably assured.

The Committee is concerned with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission increasing emphasis on the operation and maintenance of operating reactors. The Commission should assure that its actions do not undermine the nuclear industry efforts to enhance and improve maintenance by redirecting attention and resources away from the real improvements being achieved.

Because of severe budget restraints the Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of $30,000,000 to the budget request of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	$192,000
Budget estimate, 1990	200,000
House allowance	200,000
Committee recommendation	200,000

The Committee recommends $200,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin, which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91-575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River Basin and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1989	$262,000
Budget estimate, 1990	276,000
House allowance	276,000
Committee recommendation	276,000

An amount of $276,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission.

The 1989 current expense budget of the Commission is $1,648,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1989	$103,000,000
Budget estimate, 1990	87,596,000
House allowance	121,000,000
Committee recommendation	113,000,000

The Committee recommend an appropriation of $113,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority [TVA].

Consistent with the mission of TVA and the activities it conducts, the agency has custody of a wide variety of public lands, physical facilities, and natural resources. The Committee feels that adequate stewardship of these facilities and resources is needed to preserve the Federal investment and ensure that the property and facilities yield their intended public benefits on an ongoing basis.

Because a backlog of maintenance and operational deficiencies has accumulated over a period of years, the Committee has provided additional funding to better operate and maintain the system of dams, reservoirs, and navigation facilities; refurbish outmoded public facilities and other structures and resume adequate routine and cyclic maintenance; combat encroachments on public lands; suppress a burgeoning aquatic weed population; and demolish unused and unsafe facilities at the National Fertilizer Development Center.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1989 appropriation	1990 budget request	House allowance	1990 recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT				
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	245	260	260	260
Dam safety modifications	4,400	5,200	5,000	5,000
Additions and improvements	1,862	2,570	2,307	2,307
Land and forest resources	25		100	100
Land Between the Lakes facilities	98	100	100	100
Fertilizer test facilities	4,901	7,085	6,901	6,901
Lock replacement			449	449
General services	1,453	1,520	6,901	6,901
Total, capital investment	12,984	16,735	16,633	16,633
OPERATING EXPENSES				
Natural resources:				
Water resources	5,205	7,320	7,190	7,190
Reservoir system operations	25,388	27,764	31,416	29,217
Land and forest resources	3,622	1,500	3,622	3,622
Resource management and development support	3,247	3,027	3,477	3,477
Land Between the Lakes	6,371	7,063	7,071	7,071
Total, natural resources	43,833	46,674	52,776	50,577
Economic resources	12,871		18,223	12,871
Agricultural Institute	3,989	1,900	3,989	3,989

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1989 appropriation	1990 budget request	House allowance	1990 recommendation
National fertilizer research and development:				
Fertilizer research	15,132	13,507	15,132	15,132
Technology introduction	10,680	8,000	10,680	10,680
Hardwood fuels research	2,787		2,787	2,787
Total, national fertilizer development	28,599	21,507	28,599	28,599
General services	724	780	780	780
Total, operating expenses	90,016	70,861	104,367	96,816
Reduction for anticipated unobligated balances				−449,000
Total, appropriations	103,000	87,596	121,000	113,000

OTHER TEMPORARY COMMISSIONS

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	$2,000,000
House allowance	2,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,000,000

An amount of $2,000,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

This appropriation provides for the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendents of 1987 directed the Nuclear Waste Negotiator to attempt to find a State or Indian tribe willing to host a nuclear waste repository or monitored retrivable storage facility at a technically qualified site on reasonable terms and to negotiate with any State or Indian tribe which expresses an interest in hosting a repository or monitored retrievable storage facility.

OFFICE OF THE NUCLEAR WASTE NEGOTIATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1989	
Budget estimate, 1990	$2,000,000
House allowance	2,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,000,000

The Committee recommends $2,000,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator.

This appropriation provides for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1990: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	19,037	18,524	17,808	[1] 17,791
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1990				[2] 11,179
1991				6,168
1992				950
1993				102
1994 and future year				26
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1990 in the bill		144		40
	Direct loans		Loan guarantees	
Credit authority estimates, fiscal year 1990	32	32		

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1989	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1990	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$12,000,000	$12,000,000	
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	282,000	282,000	
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	40,195,000	48,664,000	+$8,469,000
Department of Energy:			
Payments to States under Federal Power Act	2,446,000	2,446,000	
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	211,200,000	218,500,000	+7,300,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	648,500,000	628,100,000	−20,400,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	914,623,000	909,992,000	−4,631,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Rivers and harbors contributed funds	185,000,000	215,550,000	+30,550,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	68,776,000	49,095,000	−19,681,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	69,567,000	64,931,000	−5,636,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust funds	4,100,000	4,184,000	+84,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	327,443,000	333,760,000	+6,317,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1989 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1989 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	142,405,000	126,108,000	123,312,000	131,086,000	-11,319,000	+4,978,000	+7,774,000
Construction, general	1,184,735,000	1,201,790,000	1,127,912,000	1,124,070,000	-60,665,000	-77,720,000	-3,842,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	337,980,000	337,000,000	342,186,000	335,970,000	-2,010,000	-1,030,000	-6,216,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,370,714,000	1,282,622,000	1,382,081,000	1,396,104,000	+25,390,000	+113,482,000	+14,023,000
Revenues Applied	---	---	---	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000
General regulatory functions	60,427,000	69,427,000	69,427,000	69,427,000	+9,000,000	---	---
(By transfer)	(3,325,000)	---	---	---	(-3,325,000)	---	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	20,000,000	---	---	---	-20,000,000	---	---
Revolving Fund	---	23,000,000	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000	-13,000,000	+10,000,000
General expenses	120,000,000	128,800,000	127,300,000	128,800,000	+8,800,000	---	+1,500,000
(By transfer)	(2,600,000)	---	---	---	(-2,600,000)	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil: New budget (obligational) authority	3,236,261,000	3,168,747,000	3,172,218,000	3,155,457,000	-80,804,000	-13,290,000	-16,761,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							

Bureau of Reclamation

General investigations	14,250,000	11,550,000	11,230,000	11,330,000	-2,920,000	-220,000	+100,000
Construction program	712,305,000	644,307,000	661,008,000	662,120,000	-50,185,000	+17,813,000	+1,112,000
Operation and maintenance	187,731,000	232,287,000	212,287,000	212,287,000	+24,556,000	-20,000,000	---
Loan program	26,022,000	33,292,000	34,122,000	34,122,000	+8,100,000	+830,000	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(27,766,000)	(31,092,000)	(31,922,000)	(31,922,000)	(+4,156,000)	(+830,000)	---
General administrative expenses	48,313,000	47,983,000	47,983,000	47,983,000	-330,000	---	---
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
Working Capital fund	4,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	+4,500,000	---	---
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-2,485,000)	(-3,564,000)	(-3,564,000)	(-3,564,000)	(-1,079,000)	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	993,621,000	973,919,000	976,130,000	977,342,000	-16,279,000	-1,577,000	+1,212,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	993,621,000	978,919,000	976,130,000	977,342,000	-16,279,000	-1,577,000	+1,212,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(27,766,000)	(31,092,000)	(31,922,000)	(31,922,000)	(+4,156,000)	(+830,000)	---
(By transfer)	(-2,485,000)	(-3,564,000)	(-3,564,000)	(-3,564,000)	(-1,079,000)	---	---

TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,828,394,000	1,859,987,000	1,851,327,000	1,925,187,000	+96,793,000	+65,200,000	+73,860,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	313,932,000	302,289,000	289,489,000	290,279,000	23,653,000	-12,010,000	+790,000
Subtotal	2,142,326,000	2,162,276,000	2,140,816,000	2,215,466,000	+73,140,000	+53,190,000	+74,650,000
Isotope production and distribution fund	---	16,243,000	16,243,000	16,243,000	+16,243,000	---	---
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,118,080,000	1,376,800,000	1,376,800,000	1,361,800,000	+243,720,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	70,000,000	68,200,000	68,200,000	66,200,000	-3,800,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Subtotal	1,188,080,000	1,445,000,000	1,445,000,000	1,428,000,000	+239,920,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1989 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recom-mendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1989 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
Gross revenues	-1,429,000,000	-1,445,000,000	-1,500,900,000	-1,500,900,000	-71,900,000	-55,900,000	---
Net appropriation	-240,920,000	---	-55,900,000	-72,900,000	+168,020,000	-72,900,000	-17,000,000
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	717,578,000	770,981,000	730,240,000	733,740,000	+16,162,000	-37,241,000	+3,500,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	204,538,000	398,450,000	332,191,000	364,691,000	+160,153,000	-33,759,000	+32,500,000
Subtotal	922,116,000	1,169,431,000	1,062,431,000	1,098,431,000	+176,315,000	-71,000,000	+36,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	369,832,000	500,000,000	424,700,000	350,000,000	-19,832,000	-150,000,000	-74,700,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	6,695,925,000	7,588,487,000	7,933,487,000	7,787,790,000	+1,091,865,000	+199,303,000	-145,697,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,404,075,000	1,798,513,000	1,758,813,000	1,766,308,000	+362,233,000	-32,205,000	+7,495,000
Subtotal	8,100,000,000	9,387,000,000	9,692,300,000	9,554,098,000	+1,454,098,000	+167,098,000	-138,202,000
Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	396,503,000	405,365,000	355,461,000	351,024,000	-45,479,000	-54,341,000	-4,437,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	7,162,000	3,273,000	3,273,000	3,273,000	-3,889,000	---	---
Subtotal	403,665,000	408,638,000	358,734,000	354,297,000	-49,368,000	-54,341,000	4,437,000

Miscellaneous revenues	-240,725,000	-228,715,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	+90,725,000	+78,715,000	---
Net appropriation	162,940,000	179,923,000	208,734,000	204,297,000	+41,357,000	+24,374,000	-4,437,000
Office of the Inspector General	---	22,959,000	22,959,000	22,959,000	+22,959,000	---	---
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,159,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	-14,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	36,267,000	42,369,000	18,469,000	18,469,000	-17,798,000	-23,900,000	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	15,389,000	25,172,000	25,172,000	25,172,000	+9,783,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	270,928,000	311,233,000	291,233,000	291,233,000	+20,305,000	-20,000,000	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(2,485,000)	(3,564,000)	(3,564,000)	(3,564,000)	(+1,079,000)	---	---
Subtotal	325,743,000	381,919,000	338,019,000	338,019,000	+12,276,000	-43,900,000	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	108,760,000	116,550,000	116,550,000	116,550,000	+7,790,000	---	---
Revenues Applied	-108,760,000	-116,550,000	-116,550,000	-116,550,000	-7,790,000	---	---
Subtotal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy:							
New budget (obligational) authority	11,782,112,000	13,819,826,000	13,850,377,000	13,726,688,000	+1,944,576,000	-93,138,000	-123,689,000
Operating Expenses	(11,782,112,000)	(13,819,826,000)	(13,850,377,000)	(13,726,688,000)	(+1,944,576,000)	(-93,138,000)	(-123,689,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(1,999,707,000)	(2,570,725,000)	(2,451,966,000)	(2,490,751,000)	(+491,044,000)	(-79,974,000)	(+38,785,000)
(By transfer)	(2,485,000)	(3,564,000)	(3,564,000)	(3,564,000)	(+1,079,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1989 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −): 1989 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission:							
Appalachian regional development programs	110,700,000	---	110,000,000	150,000,000	+39,300,000	+150,000,000	+40,000,000
Defense Nuclear Safety Board:							
Salaries and expenses	---	---	10,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	+7,000,000	-3,000,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	205,000	214,000	214,000	214,000	+9,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	263,000	345,000	345,000	345,000	+82,000	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	468,000	559,000	559,000	559,000	+91,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	379,000	---	100,000	300,000	-79,000	+300,000	+200,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	420,000,000	472,100,000	442,100,000	442,100,000	+22,100,000	-30,000,000	---
Revenues	-189,000,000	-156,750,000	-146,850,000	-146,850,000	+42,150,000	+9,900,000	---
Subtotal	231,000,000	315,350,000	295,250,000	295,250,000	+64,250,000	-20,100,000	---

Office of the Inspector General	---	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	+2,900,000	---	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	231,000,000	318,250,000	298,150,000	298,150,000	+67,150,000	-20,100,000	---
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	192,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+8,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	262,000	276,000	276,000	276,000	+14,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	454,000	476,000	476,000	476,000	+22,000	---	---
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	103,000,000	87,596,000	121,000,000	113,000,000	+10,000,000	+25,404,000	-8,000,000
Other Temporary Commissions:							
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000	---	---
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000	---	---
Total, Other Temporary Commissions	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+4,000,000	---	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	446,001,000	410,861,000	544,285,000	573,485,000	+127,484,000	+162,624,000	+29,200,000
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority	16,457,995,000	18,378,373,000	18,543,010,000	18,432,972,000	+1,974,977,000	+54,599,000	-110,038,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(27,766,000)	(31,092,000)	(31,922,000)	(31,922,000)	(+4,156,000)	(+830,000)	---
(By transfer)	(5,925,000)	---	---	---	(-5,925,000)	---	---